

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

A BI-MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.

EDITED BY THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME XIX.



COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.
1899.

INDEX.

NUMBER 1.

	PAGE
Lest We Forget. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D., Columbus, O.....	1
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	29
The League Status in the Church. By Rev. E. Cronenwett, A. M., Butler, Pa.....	41
The Greater Sin. By Rev. C. F. W. Allwardt, A. B., Shelbyville, Ill	54
Tertullian as a Philosopher. By Rev. J. C. Schacht.....	60

NUMBER 2.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	65
Final Revision of the English Translation of Luther's Small Catechism	77
The League Status in the Church. By Rev. E. Cronenwett, A. M., Butler, Pa.....	88
The Theology of the German Universities. By Rev. Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D., Columbus, O.....	111
Medical Missions. By Rev. Charles A. Schaeffer, A. B., Hartford City, Ind.....	119
1 Thess. 4, 3-8. By Rev. G. Dillman, A. M. Fostoria, O.....	124
Notes	126

NUMBER 3.

The Charge of Narrowness. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D., Columbus, O	129
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	142
The Principles of the Cultus.....	157
The Point of Emphasis in Preaching Christ to the Unsaved. By Rev. J. Sheatsley, Delaware, O.....	168
Many and Long Ceremonies. By Rev. L. M. Hunt, A. B., Thornville, O	178
A Mirror for Pastors. Translated from the German of Guthe by Rev. W. E. Tressel, Baltimore, Md.....	183
New Testament Chronology. By Rev. Prof. Geo. H. Schodde, Ph. D., Columbus, O.....	188

NUMBER 4.

	PAGE
The Charge of Narrowness. By Prof. M. Loy, D. D., Columbus, O	193
The League Status in the Church. By Rev. E. Cronenwett, A. M., Butler, Pa.....	212
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	235
Notes	255

NUMBER 5.

The Church Year in the Lutheran Church.....	257
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	291
How to Establish a Parochial School in a Field Where There Has Been None. By Rev. J. H. Schneider, A. M.....	309
Notes	319

NUMBER 6.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Briefly Explained by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn, D. D., Columbus, O.....	321
Theses on the Third Commandment. By Rev. J. Sheatsley, Delaware, O	330
Joseph Rabbinowitz. By Rev. Paul S. L. Janowitz, A. B., Columbus, O	346
The Missionary Period of the Old Testament. By Rev. Prof. L. H. Schuh, Ph. D., Columbus, O.....	361
Funeral Sermon. By Rev. L. H. Burry, Massillon, O.....	367
Notes	371

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

FEBRUARY, 1899.

No. 1.

LEST WE FORGET.

BY PROFESSOR M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

When the Book of Concord was published in 1580 it was prefaced by an address of the electors, princes and deputies of the holy Roman Empire in Germany who were adherents of the Augsburg Confession in which some important principles were declared and explanations were made. Learning in literature and science has advanced since then, and the opinion is prevalent that these principles have become antiquated and must be regarded as obsolete. In the interest of the Church of Christ and of man's salvation this is deplorable. We say this not because the advancement of learning is to be regarded as an evil. On the contrary, it is plainly in accord with the creative plan of God that man, endowed with powers of knowledge and thought, should not only replenish the earth, but subdue it. Gen. 1, 28. What is deplorable is not the advancement of learning, not even that which has come to the surface as advanced science in opposition to the contents of the biblical revelation and as higher criticism in opposition to the inspired character of the books of the Bible. The evil lies not in the learning, but in the failure to utilize all its resources and scope and rightly to apply it, and thus to institute and practice an abuse that operates against the truth of God and the salvation of man. Setting a partial truth against the whole, and claiming for it exclusive right as against the whole, cannot but work injuriously. If sunshine and rain are blessings, it is right and

good to recognize them as such, but it is spiritually disastrous to infer that we need no God who gives us the sunshine and the rain. And that is what the human heart in virtue of its sinfulness is prone to do, and what science that refuses to recognize God, and the higher criticism that disregards supernatural revelation, is constantly doing. Is it any wonder then that Christians who know the Savior and His truth have no respect for such science and such criticism with all its erudition?

The vast learning which our age has accumulated seems to cast all the earnest and conscientious study of the Bible by our forefathers into the shade. But it is necessary to remind our time that all the learning and all the reasoning of men, whether in the dark ages or in this nineteenth century of enlightenment, has never saved a soul and has not the ability to save a soul. Mortifying and preposterous as that may be to the proud conceit of these days of worldly wisdom, it is the sober truth; and those who know the truth will understand how it comes that pity for the narrowness of scientists and philosophers and critics is mixed with a degree of contempt for their superciliousness. Let us have done with the notion that because the moon gives light we need no sun, and that because science has learned a little of the revelation which God gives of Himself in nature, that is, in His work of creation and providence, we need no supernatural revelation, and especially no revelation of His merciful plan of salvation through the merits of Christ by faith in His name.

To our fathers Jesus was all in all, and they were willing to risk everything and sacrifice everything, that they might be found in Christ and inherit the salvation which He secured by His sufferings and death for all men. They learned something from other sources than nature, and they knew it with a joyous certainty and peaceful assurance which, in the nature of mind and matter and their relation to each other, is always lacking in the science that is falsely so called but is always conceited and proud and presumptuous in proportion to its narrowness and shallowness, and therefore to the invalidity of all its boastful claims of science. True science is always aware of its limitations, and when it has made due account of what even nature teaches in regard

to God and righteousness is always humble. It cannot but confess that its readings of nature are imperfect, seeing that this, so far as the revelation of God's will is concerned, is of the same nature as that of inferring an agent's will from his actions or interpreting symbols by human ingenuity. There is more in mind than that which becomes manifest in action, and reasoning from the latter to the power or disposition of the former is likely to be fallacious. And when the blindness of the human heart by reason of sin is taken into account, that reasoning concerning God and His will toward men is sure to be fallacious, because the depraved and darkened human heart is in a condition that, with all its intelligence, can make due account neither of man's sin nor God's grace in Christ, which are the essential factors in the problem. Science and philosophy, using all the knowledge which can be drawn from the revelation in the world around us and in the intuitions of the human mind, knows no explanation of the facts which present themselves in consequence of the awful catastrophe in Eden, and knows no remedy for the evil that is upon us, except in the delusive effort to save ourselves from the wreck by the force of will. Man is utterly helpless in the ruin which the fall has wrought, and his only help is in the name of the Lord. But the help which the infinite mercy of our God has provided in Christ — nature knows nothing of that, and only the Bible, the book of supernatural revelation given by inspiration of God, teaches it. What in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. Eph. 3, 5.

This Word that was given by inspiration of God, and which solved the weightiest problems of all human thought and brought to the human mind the information which neither nature around us or within us could teach, and without which all the lessons of providence in past history and present experience were and are unintelligible, our fathers believed. That faith of the operation of God nerved them for every conflict. They believed, and therefore they spake. It was not the uncertainty of science falsely so called, but the assurance of faith that moved them, and therefore they were ready to die, if need be, in witness of their faith. They believed, and were not ashamed and not confounded.

Ashamed of Jesus and His Word: what an amazing suggestion to a Christian who knows the Savior of his sinful soul and rejoices in the God of his salvation! And how could they be confounded who put their trust in Him who has redeemed us all and who is Lord of all and makes all things work together for good to them that love Him! It is needful that we remind Christians of these fundamental things, lest we forget.

In such faith, not in reliance upon any human science, whether much or little, Luther and his coadjutors entered upon the great work of the Reformation. If science of the works of nature in its present advanced stage, and of biblical literature as presented by the higher criticism, had existed then, what difference could that have made in the assurance of their faith, which rested wholly on the supernatural revelation of God in Christ as given in the inspired Word? That made them certain, because the Lord spoke in that by words, which are clearer than actions and symbols, and the Holy Ghost, by the power of grace inherent in the words of revelation, led them to the apprehension of the truth and enabled them to embrace it by faith. Not by the power of their own minds, which were just as incompetent for the work as is the science and learning of our day, but by the power of the Holy Ghost did they believe the truth revealed, and were sure because God who never lies had spoken, and because the Spirit of God enabled them to believe the truth which He revealed. The reformers had therefore not only the better of the argument on natural grounds. They had that. But this would never have made them the heroes that they were. They were intent on saving their own souls and the souls of them whom they were called to direct. Christians knew then, and know now, that this could be done only by the power of the Holy Ghost who applies to lost souls the salvation which is in Christ and in Him alone, and which is brought to us only in the gospel that proclaims His grace and exerts His power. The reformers were Christians in deed and in truth, and were therefore ready for any hazard or any sacrifice; for they believed and were therefore sure that if they lost honor and goods, child and wife, and even their lives in the struggle, they would win the victory and it would be well worth the price. What a triviality

all those things are compared with the preservation of the truth revealed from heaven, on which their own salvation and the salvation of their children and their children's children depended to all generations! All honor to the heroes of those days that tried men's souls — rather all honor to the God of our salvation who gave those humble Christians the faith which could not otherwise than confess their Savior and made them heroes in the struggle!

When their labors and sufferings are contemplated from the standpoint of modern progress in natural science and historic learning and philosophic reasoning, their whole work dwindles into a fanatical strife of opinion and a proud contention for superiority of men on the one side against men on the other. Nothing could be more natural than that the verdict of human reason on such a basis would be against the reformation. How could it be otherwise when, in the first place, it is assumed that the whole conflict is a clash between human opinion and human opinion, and, in the second place, between an obscure monk with his little following and a powerful hierarchy with its multitudinous adherents, some sincere and some sycophantic, some equipped with swords, but all intent on the destruction of the little flock that dared to question the invincible power of popery? It is necessary to remind the Church and the world that the question was not this at all, but that whether God or man should be recognized as the ruler of heaven and earth, and therefore whether God's Word or man's notions should decide the destinies of man in time and in eternity. It is needful to remind men of this, lest we forget!

Our controversy with Rome is the same now that it was in the days of the Reformation. Modern science, so far as it is manipulated by infidels, and modern learning in biblical literature as represented in the so-called higher criticism that ignores divine inspiration and seeks to hide its antipathy by emphasizing the so-called claims of the human side of revelation, which only means that God revealed His Word through the instrumentality of men, who were inspired for the purpose, comes to the aid of popery, though mostly unconsciously and often in outspoken though unintelligent and shallow opposition to Romish pretensions. Whether intentional, in unconcealed enmity to the Christian revela-

tion, which sets forth the incarnate Son of God as the Savior of the world and therefore recognizes no salvation by human science and learning and effort and work, or unintentional, in the sincere desire to uphold the legitimate claims of science but contracted in its views because ignoring the larger and more perspicuous revelation which the merciful Lord of the universe has given in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the trend of modern science and philosophy and learning and literature is not favorable to the Gospel, and to the same extent and in the same degree in which it is unfavorable to the gospel of the grace of God in Christ it is, so far as it is willing to recognize Christianity at all, materially an ally of the pope, that great and powerful usurper of the throne of Christ, who "sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," (2 Thess. 2, 4) and who by the deceivableness of unrighteousness has brought millions to recognize his usurpation. This has kept Romanism a power on earth, and will maintain it as the Antichrist until the judgment comes, "whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming." 2 Thess. 2, 8. Our age has little understanding for the fierce struggle of our fathers against popery in the glorious days of the Reformation, and therefore but little appreciation of the Reformation itself. Were there not Christians under the domination of the pope? Were not the Roman organizations Christian congregations? Did not Luther and his co-workers bring strife and division among these Christian people? And was not that a violation of the law of love and therefore a sinful proceeding that made a schism amid strife and contention, instead of conceding everything in the spirit of charity and in the pursuit of peace at every cost? Modern indifference that is called tolerance, and carnal sentiment that is called charity have difficulty to find any reasonable excuse for the Reformation. Whether consciously or unconsciously they are in league with Rome by their advocacy of misapprehended human rights, which have a solid foundation in the divine arrangement of human relations, but which are utterly chimerical when the divine government is disregarded and the sinful folly of man claims rights of reason and sentiment against the God that made them and assigned them their

place and duties in the world. Our fathers, who knew not only what science and philosophy and history teaches, and knew more of it than many a modern scientist and devotee of higher criticism, with all their boasts of progress and advancement in this nineteenth century, but knew also the revelation of the mind of God as written for our learning in Holy Scripture, understood better and appreciated more wisely the things that belong to our peace. They believed, and therefore they spoke. The Word of God, given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, was their absolute guide, to which every power of thought and feeling and will must be subject, and to which in the faith which He wrought every power of the soul was subject. They said in their *Apology*, Art. 14: "Because the bishops will not tolerate us unless we depart from the doctrine which we have confessed, though before God we are bound to confess and to maintain this doctrine, we must let the bishops go and obey God rather than men, knowing that the Christian Church is where the Word of God is rightly taught. The bishops may see to it how they will give account to God for rending and devastating the Church by such tyranny." They believed the gospel, of which human science and sentiment by nature knows nothing, and therefore they had the assurance of faith against all human thought and feeling. We also believe — God help our unbelief! — and therefore remind Christians of this feeble and flabby generation of the truth in Jesus as revealed in Holy Scripture, lest we forget, lest we forget!

The same faith which led and nerved the reformers in their conflict with Rome directed them in their opposition to errorists who, while they refused subjection to the pope, were not willing to submit entirely to the Word. The controversy with them was the same in principle. It was not at all a question of opinion on natural grounds or of taste and natural inclination one way or the other. They knew enough of human science and philosophy, notwithstanding their alleged inferiority in this respect to the scholars of our day in their great advancement of learning, to be quite sure that their consciences could not be quieted and their controversy with error and sin could not be settled on the basis of nature. The world and all that is in the world could

give them no peace in their intense experience of the earnestness of the law and the terror of its condemnation. They knew something more than this. God revealed His grace in Jesus Christ our Savior, and they had learned the Holy Scriptures in which this revelation is written. They believed this word which was given by inspiration of God, and thus had a knowledge and assurance which no human science could give. That revelation gave them light respecting the will of God as the revelation in creation and providence were not designed to give it and could not give it. The salvation of the soul from the curse of sin through the incarnation and work of the Son of God and the mission of the Holy Ghost in pursuance of that work are no part of the revelation given in nature, and are therefore not even obscurely brought to the knowledge of man by the science which confines itself to nature. But these things which are the most essential for the accomplishment of man's destiny and for his happiness in time and eternity are clearly made known in the Scriptures. Our fathers read the revelation, and the Lord God, who in mercy gave it, graciously wrought in their hearts by its supernatural power the faith which accepts it. They believed, and therefore they spoke. The Word of God, as a source of knowledge and assurance distinct from all human convictions and sentiments and tastes resting on natural grounds, made them certain of the things which belonged to their peace. Hence they could just as little make concessions to those who called themselves Protestants when they refused to accept the absolute authority of the Scriptures as they could to the Papists. It was not the name, but the truth of God about which they were concerned. The party that opposed the Romish claims but would not accept the Lutheran confession was not refused fellowship or rejected because of any difference of opinion or taste. If some who accepted the truth in Christ as revealed in Holy Scripture were induced to set forth that truth and to illustrate it and in consequence of a variant taste to order the forms and ceremonies of worship in a different way from theirs, that did not trouble them in the least, as such differences do not trouble Lutheran Christians now. What was it to them, and what is it to us, if there is diversity of opinion and taste, of culture and custom among Chris-

tians, so long as they are one in the faith which clings absolutely to the truth spoken by God's behest through prophets and apostles and written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost in our blessed Bible, and so long as in the love which comes of faith they do not permit such human differences to disturb the divine unity of the faith? These differences exert some influence and therefore we cannot wholly disregard them. Christians are desirous of making everything tributary to the glory of their Lord and the salvation of the souls which He has purchased with a price, and therefore cannot but be anxious that this influence should be exerted to further the cause of truth and righteousness. But the truth is God's and stands securely on the revelation which God has given. These influences can affect only the individual souls in their relation to it, not the truth itself. That stands as the divine guide and regulative and correlative amid all the diversities of opinion and taste and all the changes to which these are subject. What our fathers contended for and suffered for was not at all their peculiar opinions and tastes, but the faith which was once delivered to the saints. That rests wholly on the Word. Science and learning and education and custom has primarily and fundamentally nothing to do with it. Nature does not and cannot teach it. It is not presented in the intuitions of reason; it is not furnished by intuitions of sense; it is not given by the natural intuitions of consciousness. And therefore it is not inferrible by thought on the things around us or the soul within us. It is given only in the Word supernaturally revealed in Holy Scriptures. The acceptance of that, which is made ours by faith, is all that our fathers insisted on and that the Lutheran Church insists on now. But that must be insisted on whether those who oppose or ignore its teaching call themselves Catholics or Evangelicals. The name, though this too has some influence in our thinking which we must not disregard, is in itself of small account, but the truth revealed in Holy Scriptures, which gives spiritual light and life, is everlasting and all-pervading in its import and its result. That must be maintained in its integrity as God gives it in the Scriptures, that no man take our crown, and must be defended at all hazards, whether assailants call themselves Jews or Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants. For it is no

opinion or taste of person or party, or custom in which the opinion or taste of nations had crystallized, that our fathers felt called to maintain even at the sacrifice of their homes and lives. That would have been penny wise and pound foolish. They were true soldiers of the cross to whom the whole world was a trifle compared with the gospel on which the whole world's salvation depends. If the reader should think we repeat too much, our answer is that it seems to us necessary, lest we forget: lest we forget the main thing while human sophistry and passion seeks to absorb us in accidents that profit nothing.

This sophistry and passion lay hold especially of two points in human nature which present its weakness to their attacks. It is ignorant of the things that pertain to its peace, but has the pride of reason and the sway of sentiment, both of which are in league with nature as sin has darkened it and perverted it. Hence reason and feeling assert themselves against the powers of grace, even when these have entered the soul and become forces in its activity and factors in the outcome. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit." In the nature of the case it cannot be otherwise, because the powers of grace are introduced into souls which have natural powers of intellect and sensibility and accordingly of will that are adverse to all its aims and strivings. Hence even among Christians there are antagonisms to the impulses of the Holy Spirit, and the mind is moved by them and seeks to justify them. If these are not resisted by the power of the gospel as it has entered as a personal force into the human soul, the result will be the same as in the natural man. Human reason and sensibility will assert themselves as regulatives, and the decision will of course be in favor of nature as against the supernatural power and requirement of grace. The conflict between nature and grace is the same when the flesh wars in the individual soul against the powers of grace and makes inroads upon its peace, as it is when nature asserts itself against grace in general. The flesh in the Church is the same thing as the flesh in the world, and is as much at enmity with God in the one relation as in the other. The entrance of the powers of grace is a hindrance to its work of destruction, but if the soul succumbs to its power that destruction will result notwithstanding the grace.

The proclamation of this grace by the gospel through the redemption of the incarnate Son of God avails nothing for those who remain in their natural condition of sin and rebellion, and helps nothing where those who profess allegiance to it succumb to the power of sin as that is in our nature and works death. Grace and nature are opposites, and the opposition is the same in kind, whether it appear in the antagonism between Christianity and heathenism, between Romanism and Evangelism, between Lutheranism and Reformism, however great may be the difference in the degree in which each asserts its power and produces its results under these varying conditions. What our fathers contended for was always the salvation in Christ by grace as revealed in the word of the gospel, and what they contended against was always the claim of salvation by human power and the knowledge of salvation by natural light. And that is what the Church of the Augsburg Confession means when she speaks of the two fundamental principles of the Reformation, that the sinner is justified alone by faith in Christ and that the Word of God alone is the rule of faith and conscience, and when she rejects everything that conflicts with these principles, even to the extent of refusing to fellowship those who persist, after instruction and admonition is given, in causing divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which we have learned from the Scriptures, though they with us profess to be adherents of Christianity. Let us, in these times that need it much, return to first principles, lest we forget.

That such a course must seem uncharitable to the natural mind is evident, and Lutherans who look into the great questions underlying the practice of their forefathers cannot be surprised at it. The conditions are such that they can reasonably expect to be reviled as selfishly exclusive and bigotted. If a heathen is just and generous in his dealings with his fellow men, does he not merit our esteem as well as a Christian? Why should we not then, if he desires to co-operate with Christians for the promotion of love and righteousness, welcome him to our fold? What we profess as the truth in Christ unto salvation is to him a subordinate matter, and he is willing to tolerate it for the sake of the higher aim of making people good, in which he is heartily

at one with us. Should not we Christians show ourselves equally large-hearted and magnanimous by embracing him as a brother in the great interest of humanity, notwithstanding his dissent from our peculiar faith in Christ and the gospel of His grace? That is the ground which all naturalism takes and cannot otherwise than take, and which therefore all the religionists of secret lodges that are based on the so-called wider ground of universal humanity against the particularism of so-called sect must of necessity take. Considering their condition we cannot complain of this. On the ground of natural reason they act reasonably — just as reasonably as the philosopher of the Indies who never saw ice and therefore hooted at every suggestion that implied its existence or its possibility. But there are sources of information that give our knowledge a larger scope. Is it uncharitable to utilize these wider sources and this wider knowledge? It is customary among the cultured to pity those whose views of nature are limited, and to treat with scorn those whose narrow notions are asserted against the discoveries of science in that field. Should it be a matter of wonder if Christians, in their recognition of a light which nature cannot give, occasionally felt a modicum of contempt for the science that is supercilious in its carnal rejection of the truth of revelation and pronounces all the knowledge which lies beyond its narrow horizon a mere superstition? The heathen may mean well in his natural sentimentalism, but the humanity for which he proposes to work will go down in the destruction from which Christianity is designed to rescue the human race, and Christians only stultify themselves when they yield to the clamors of humanity as against the appeals of grace which would save humanity from the death that is upon it and the everlasting death to which it tends. It is well worth the suffering to which we must needs be subjected in our advocacy of the cause of grace in Christ, if here and there, as the promises of God assure us will be the case, a soul shall be saved by our preaching of Christ as the only Savior and our uncompromising insistence on this truth of supernatural revelation, notwithstanding the opposition of humanity in its carnal wisdom and carnal love and the persecution to which it subjects us as men who are as unscientific as they are uncharitable. The

heathen is not at one with us in the main thing, which is the salvation of the soul by faith in Jesus Christ, declared by prophets and apostles to be the Savior of the world, beside whom there is no other name given by which we could be saved. He cannot be recognized as one of us in the Church because, however good his intentions may be to further the cause of righteousness and love with us, the righteousness at which he aims and the love which he practices are an entirely different thing from the righteousness which is of God by faith and the love which the grace of God works by faith. In light and in life nature and grace are not the same, and believers in Jesus cannot walk together with those who reject Him. What fellowship hath light with darkness?

But the case seems to many entirely different when the parties concerned are all professedly Christians. It was not against confessed heathens that our forefathers of reformation days contended, but against people who professed to be followers of Christ and even claimed to be better disciples of our blessed Master than Luther and his co-workers. It does seem in reason that this makes a material difference. Had the great reformer any right to create a division among the people of God? Let us keep in mind, first of all, that the matter in dispute was not one of philosophy and science, of opinion and taste. It pertained not to the temporal, but to the eternal interests of men, and involved the eternal interests of all men — not only of the Evangelical party, but of the Romanists as well; and not only of the party that professed to be Christians, but of the Jews and Gentiles and Mohammedans as well. It was a question that embraced the salvation of the whole human race, not of a society or a sect. Nothing could be more radically wrong than the assumption that what Luther designed and what the Lutheran Church meant in its confession at Augsburg was the salvation of a special party that had special wants and therefore was to be saved in a special way. By the grace of God the Lutheran Church is wise enough and virtuous enough to eschew any such particularistic and narrow notion. Trusting in the Word of God she never did want, and does not now want, anything but the truth of God unto the salvation of all men. Her confession is the declaration of that truth

in Jesus as it is given in the Scriptures for the salvation of all men. From that there can be no appeal, and in regard to that there can be no concessions. It is the truth which God has supernaturally given us by inspiration, and which the Holy Ghost enables us to receive by faith. How could it then be possible for any soul to relinquish this truth without relinquishing its faith and with it the love for souls which is born of this faith? The Lutheran Church is often spoken of as a particular church, and the historical conditions are such that she must consent to be treated as such, seeing that she has never succeeded in drawing into her organization all sincere believers in Christ Jesus, the only Savior of the world. But never for a moment can she consent that her faith is the faith of a party that expects to be saved in its own peculiar way, whilst other parties have other peculiar ways of salvation that must be recognized as equally authorized by the Word of God and therefore equally effectual. There is only one way of salvation, and that is through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, who has purchased us with His own blood. Every other way is false. Whatever reason or feeling or fancy or taste may suggest, or men under the influence of these may maintain, to believers it remains beyond question that "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4, 12. The reformation was not directed primarily against Gentiles and Turks and Jews. It was a reformation of the Church of Christ, not of a religion that lives and moves confessedly outside of the pale of Christendom. All this is admitted, and the opponents of the Church of the Reformation are entitled to all the advantages which such an admission may give them before the public. What then had the saving grace in Christ alone and the authority of the Scriptures alone in all matters pertaining to that grace, to do with dissensions among Christians? Nothing at all, as some Protestants who are forgetful of the fundamental difference between nature and grace and of the sources whence the knowledge of each is and alone can be derived, and as some Romanists who have fallen into line with naturalistic speculations and corresponding devices either by carnal conviction or Jesuitic design, are led to think and to act: everything, as the Christian believer, who knows no way of escape from

the damnation of hell which he is conscious of having merited but the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, and no way of assurance that this redemption avails for him but the blessed revelation given in the gospel. How can any Christian wonder that a believing soul, trusting in the word of Scripture and finding peace in the Savior whom it proclaims and of whose salvation it certifies the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost that is exerted in it and through it, is not willing at all to place this Savior and this revelation of God's truth unto salvation on an equality with human reasonings and human opinions and human tastes! And how can any such a believer, having found peace in believing through the grace of God in Christ, think it strange that there are Christians still in these days of enlightenment who are horrified at the thought of having religious congresses on equal terms with Hindoos and Jews, Mohammedans and Mormons, instead of testifying to all of them, first and last, that there is no Savior but Christ and no salvation but by faith in His name! And is it not marvelous that any such Christians should think it unkind and ungenerous and uncharitable when a brother takes offence at the fraternization not only with Romanists and other errorists of the Christian name, but even with Jews, whom ignorance often includes in the census of the Christian Church? The fact that such things are done is conclusive proof that the Reformers were right, and that the Church of the Reformation is right, when they adhered and continue to adhere to the one and only standard of the Holy Scriptures, whether those who oppose are Jews or Gentiles, Romanist or Reformed. When all claims are considered and all allowances are made, the truth still stands out in bold relief that Christ and the Bible are our only refuge and our only hope. Is there any other refuge and any other hope when the truth in Jesus is assailed by those who call themselves Christians? The reformers were called to maintain and defend that truth in the interest of human salvation. Could they make concessions to Romanists and Reformed that they could not make to Jews and Gentiles? The question was not one of a party of Christians against another party of Christians equally sure of salvation, but of the one way of salvation through Christ by faith in the gospel given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost and setting

forth the only Savior of the world. They maintained that against all the world, and it could make no difference to them what those who assailed it professed to be. And that is the position of the Church of the Reformation to this day, and by the grace of God will be to the end of time. It is the conflict of Christianity against the powers of sin as these are exerted by the devil and the world and the flesh; and this means a conflict of the supernatural power of grace as brought to lost humanity in Christ and revealed in Holy Scripture against the natural wisdom and power of man under the dominion of sin. Whether those who refuse to accept what this revelation recorded in the Bible teaches are nominally Jews or Gentiles, Christians or Mohammedans, is not essential in this conflict, whatever difference of treatment Christian wisdom might dictate in the different uses. The denial that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Living God, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, our Savior, is the same when it is made by a party absurdly claiming to be classed among Christian denominations as when it is made by a Gentile or a Jew; and the denial of the divine inspiration of the Pentateuch or the Gospels and therefore of their absolute authority as the Word of God who rules over all, to whom all intelligent creatures must give account, and who alone can save, is precisely the same when it is entered by parties calling themselves Christians, as when it is entered by a Hindoo or Confucian. The reasons for the denial are sometimes different, the spirit of the denial is sometimes different; but the denial is always the same. It is nature asserting itself against grace, whether it be in the form of reason or of feeling, whether based on traditionalism or the results of science and philosophy, or whether it be the simple and sincere utterance of the natural heart in its enmity to God or the shrewd and deceptious cloaking of that enmity in the garb of learning and of lore: it is still always the same assertion of man's natural power against the abounding grace of God revealed for the rescue of man from the corruption of his nature and the damnation which this has brought upon him. Man is lost in sin, and God alone can save. How necessary that we be reminded of this, lest we forget!

It is claimed, indeed, that the controversy between professed Christians is essentially different from the conflict between Christians and infidels. The difference must be recognized, whether it be regarded as essential or not. Those who profess to be Christians are expected to accept something which those who openly and expressly oppose Christianity do not accept. It would be preposterous to put forth a claim to membership in the Christian Church, if there were nothing at all to be urged as a support of that claim. What is it then that gives any semblance of validity to the claim as it is presented by those who deny the redemption wrought out by our blessed Savior and the revelation given in Holy Scripture? The answer is not hard to find. All the Arian and Socinian and Unitarian and Universalist parties, and all others of the same sort, recognize Christianity as a great power for good, honor Christ as a great teacher of that which is good, admit the force of His teaching for the promotion of righteousness on the earth, and lay stress on the fact that He died to make men good. What they mean is that He was a teacher of righteousness, and had the courage of His convictions even to the sacrifice of His life in their confirmation, and thus realized the idea of the poet that He reigned like the great Aurelius and bled like Socrates. But neither the great Aurelius nor Socrates were any better than, even under the powers of nature, they ought to have been, and have not the remotest claim to recognition under the powers of grace. If that were all that there is in Christianity we would assert the rights of humanity, and insist on the privilege of choosing between Confucius and Plato, between Hume and Christ. But the controversy of Christians is not at all between different systems of natural reason, but between supernatural revelation and all these systems as they are originated by man's fallen nature and supported by the benighted reason of man under the power of sin as it reigns in that fallen nature. Whether the objection to the doctrine which the Holy Scriptures teach came from a Gentile or a Jew, from a Romanist or a Protestant, the answer must always be found in the Word, which reveals the grace of God. This gives us light where all nature is darkness.

and is therefore helpless, and gives us life and energy where all nature fails. Therefore when grace and nature come in conflict with each other between Hindoos and Christians, between Socinians and Christians, it is entirely the same thing. Why should we make much ado about it whether one that spits our Savior in the face calls himself a Jew or a Christian? A Christian who spits the Savior in the face, though it may be under a misapprehension of a different sort from that which actuates the infidel, is in no respect materially different from the Jew or Gentile who also spits in the Savior's face. In both cases it is the power of nature in its sinfulness asserting itself against grace.

But when erring Christians, moved by the power of nature, oppose any portion of the truth which the Bible teaches and the Church confesses, how then? It would be marvelous if any person who has made a study of the subject with an adequate view of the material involved, came to the conclusion that it is without all difficulty. The very statement which we have made of the point at issue suggests questions which a sincere love of the truth and of the liberty which is born of the truth cannot ignore. Are we not begging the question when we assume that those professed believers in Christ and the Gospel who deny a doctrine of our Lutheran Confession are erring Christians? and that they are moved to such denial by the powers of nature against the powers of grace? Might it not be that the Romanists and Reformed parties are right when the former condemn us as errorists or even as no Christians at all, and many of the latter in our refusal to enter into their union projects at least partially treat us in the same way? Have not the Romanists a decided advantage over us in their claim of an infallible pope who settles all human controversies as the vicar of the Lord, and have not the Reformed parties, even so far as they do not follow in the wake of popery and claim for their bishops and elders, their conventions and councils, their assemblies and synods the same authoritative power over faith and conscience, a superior method of dealing with differences when they proclaim absolute and universal liberty for each one to believe as he pleases and to do what is right in his own eyes? Neither the scope of our article nor the limits of this periodical ad-

mit of a discussion of these and other similar questions that are presented in the various ramifications of the subject. We cannot here traverse the whole field of theology in its bearing on the complex matter before us. Our aim is only to call into remembrance some Christian principles as the Reformation has brought them to light, lest we forget — lest in these days of advanced science and advanced Romanism and advanced sectarianism and advanced religionism, we forget first principles. Romanistic notions about an infallible human arbiter in controversies of faith and conscience may commend themselves to some as the solution of a difficult problem; liberalistic notions of individual liberty under the general human right to think and do as each one assumes to be best, may commend itself to others as a better solution. But while Rationalists and Romantics and Sentimentalists and Materialists, so far as they still incline to religionism of some sort, run to the one extreme or to the other, so far as the tether of nature gives them scope, the simple Christian, who is conscious of the wrath of God upon his sin and flees for refuge to the hope set before him in Christ, still finds consolation in the only Savior of the world by faith in His name, and clings to the word of the gospel of grace in Christ, whatever popes and poets, scientists and higher critics may say or sing or demonstrate, and thus walks in the way of salvation as the Lutheran Reformation has declared it and as the Lutheran Church continues to declare it, whether he has ever been led into outward membership in the Lutheran Church or not. For our present purpose we assume that Jesus Christ is the Savior of the world, that the revelation of the truth unto salvation in Him, and in Him alone, is supernaturally given to man by God Himself; that this truth is written for our learning in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; that these books are given by inspiration of God and are therefore as infallible as God Himself, who speaks to us in the words recorded by His dictation and His authority; that this is a real revelation of the mind and will of God according to which we shall be judged on that great day when our crucified and risen Lord shall come again in His glory for the consummation of all the affairs of this earth; that as such a revelation it is clear in its words

and conveys the power to bring light and life into the souls that are darkened by the fall and dead in trespasses and sins; that ample provision has been made in the mercy of God to render this revelation effective as a supernatural right and power in contradistinction to the light and power of nature, so that it does not need and will not endure any interference with it by the endowments of nature, whether in the way of revising it or of interpreting it or of adding to its convincing or converting power; that these Scriptures, as a revelation in its whole import and its whole influence on the human mind distinct from the revelation given in nature, whether this be contained in the matter around us or in the mind within us, shines by its own supernatural light and works by its own supernatural efficacy; and that the faith which it produces in the human soul is therefore an assurance which is wholly independent of the light and trust in the Word and in the Savior whom that Word declares, without the least obligation to human science and philosophy and learning and criticism, which may all serve to weaken it in its influence on the intellect and sensibilities and will, and may serve to confirm it in the questionings of the human mind, but can neither create it nor preserve it, because it is the gift of God in the order of grace that is different from the order of nature not only in degree, but radically different in kind. We cannot here enter upon the proof of these propositions, ready as the Lutheran Church always has been and now is to maintain them against all the world. For our present purpose we must assume them as imbedded in the very life of the Christians whom we have specially in view, and whom we desire to remind of some fundamental things, lest they forget.

There are Christians who err. They err not by the power of the Holy Ghost, who makes them Christians, but by the power of nature that asserts its own wisdom and exerts its own strength, as these are given in the order of creation in distinction from the new creation in Christ Jesus. They err so far as they depart from the revelation of God's will unto salvation as this is given in the Scriptures. This error may be of such a nature as to set aside the light of grace by substituting the light of nature and to reject the power of grace in Christ by depending for

salvation entirely on the moral power of nature. But it need not be of such an exclusive character. A person may by the grace of the gospel believe in Christ unto the saving of the soul and still fall into error. He may err and still be a Christian, as he may sin in other ways and still be a Christian. The reason of this as well as the fact is expressly stated in Scripture: "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary, the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Gal. 5, 16. 17. These and similar statements of Holy Writ serve to guard against the two errors into which we are inclined to fall in the treatment of this subject. The first is the inference which reason is always ready to make from the conditions given, that if a person fails in any respect to do the will of the Spirit he cannot be a Christian and has no right to the consolation which the believing soul finds in the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. We are sinners by nature and remain sinners under grace, and never on this earth attain a degree of holiness that would enable us to dispense with the article of our faith, and the consolation and peace which it brings: "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." The second error into which we are naturally inclined to fall and which is just as emphatically refuted by the words of the Holy Ghost, is that error in doctrine, or error in life, in short, sin in any form, cannot be of any serious moment if a person can be a Christian and have the faith in Christ which is sure of salvation according to the promise of grace, notwithstanding the sin. We have already stated that we cannot, in the compass of an article like this, follow the subject in all its ramifications, and we therefore here enter upon an explanation neither of the difference between errors that are inconsistent with faith in its organic foundation, which are the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and of the material or personal foundation, which is Jesus Christ our Savior, and of the dogmatic foundation as related to the Scriptures and the Redeemer of the world whom they reveal, nor of the difference between sins, including errors of doctrine, that result from weakness of the flesh notwithstanding the

personal determination by the grace of God to walk in the Spirit, and the sins, including errors in doctrine, which result from a personal adoption and approval of the pretensions of nature as it asserts itself against the dominion of grace. We must assume that the readers whom we have in view know and believe some things that are vital in the subject before us. What to the Naturalist, whether Rationalist or Sentimentalist, whether Stoic or Epicurean, may be open to the charge of begging the question, is the necessary implication of faith in Christ as the only way of salvation and as made known to us only through the supernatural revelation given us in the Scriptures. We are not writing for unbelievers; their case demands separate treatment and requires consideration of points which nature makes against grace, but which are definitely settled as soon as the sinner finds peace in believing and are therefore not properly in controversy among Christians. They know whereof they affirm, though that knowledge be not derived from nature, whether this be regarded as embracing matter or mind or both, but from the supernatural revelation in Christ and in the Scriptures. A person may be a Christian notwithstanding the errors of his intellect and his deviations from the mind of Christ as made known in the Bible. This error and deviation may be unto death, as it always is when there is no faith in Christ and in His Word, or when they result in the expulsion of such faith from the heart by personal wilfulness in opposition to the word of Scripture or the motives of the Holy Spirit as He works through the word of Scripture. But it need not be always so, and is not always so in fact. And although they sin in all their aberrations from the Scriptures that are written by the Holy Ghost for our learning and guidance, and the wages of their sin is death, just as it is in other people and always is in all men and under all circumstances, these wages are always remitted to them that believe in Christ, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world; and to these always and under all circumstances. He that believeth shall be saved: there is no condition and no exception. All other questions that may arise regarding the sinner's salvation must lie within, not beyond this divine decision; that is, the degree of our knowledge, or of

our feeling, or of our work — the degree of our holiness in general — has nothing at all to do with our salvation, because it has nothing at all to do with the validity and the completeness of the redemption which God has effected in Christ Jesus, to which we can add nothing, whether by the process of nature or of grace, and from which we can detract nothing by our individual sins, which all belong to the burden which was laid on the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. Any sin and every sin must condemn us if we have no Savior; no sin can condemn us if we flee to that Savior whom God has provided and who by the grace of God is ours through faith. The Church is the congregation of all those who by the faith which the Holy Spirit works in the soul are united to this Savior of the world, and the churches are the external and temporal organizations of these persons in their several localities under the confession of the One Name that alone can save and the one rule of Holy Scripture which alone can give us the knowledge and assurance of this salvation. All of these children of God are such in virtue of their faith in Christ Jesus and in Him rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. But some err, and some manage to get into the churches and command an influence there who are not willing to renounce their natural wisdom and strength, but persist in them and thus succeed in corrupting whole churches, notwithstanding the sincerity of many honest believers who are unable to comprehend and properly estimate the import and danger of the error introduced and are therefore incompetent to maintain the truth of revelation as against their allegations and pretensions. Hence it comes to pass that schisms and sects arise, and one denomination of Christians sets up its altar against another denomination of Christians. It is very sad that sin thus asserts itself and hampers the work of the Lord. But what shall we do?

The Lord's will is very plain: "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness"; "a man that is a heretic after the first and second admonition reject." Eph. 5, 18; Tit. 3, 10. It is an evident lack of insight into the destructive and damnable nature of sin to urge that these and other similar words of inspiration refer not to the works of the flesh

in their less flagrant form, such as are possible even in Christians who unwittingly and unwillingly err in doctrine and life notwithstanding the light and the power which they have by the Spirit of grace, but only to those embraced in the statement: "For it is a shame to speak even of those things which are done of them in secret." Eph. 5, 12. To such things sin will lead, if no restraints are laid upon it, but need not lead even in heathendom when moral manliness even in its crippled natural possibilities asserts itself, and cannot lead in Christendom because it would occur in a Christian only by his fall from grace and relapse into his original state of natural corruption and disability. It is not sin in this or that particular form and this and that particular degree of flagrancy and heinousness as men variously estimate it, but sin in its horrible enmity to God in any and every form, conscious and unconscious, that is deadly and damnable. The Christian who supposes that he is exempt from the damnation of hell because his transgressions of the law and shortcomings of its requirements are comparatively so trivial that God does not range them under the category of sin at all, seeing that his intentions are right and his works of righteousness in pursuance of such intentions are many, and largely overbalance any little defects that may become manifest, is imperiling his own soul by his delusion and is at heart a Romanist, whatever may be his religious profession. He imperils his soul, because in proportion as he magnifies his sinlessness and righteousness he minimizes the righteousness of Christ and loses hold upon Him as the only Savior from sin and death. He is at heart a Romanist, because the distinctive element of Romanism as a Christian organization is the assertion of human power on the natural basis of creation as against the power of God on the supernatural basis of redemption, and its consequent system of self-righteousness with its human merit and human authority, as if these would ever be, whether under nature or under grace, a substitute for the merits of Christ or the authority of God set forth in the Scriptures and exercised through the Word which is there written by inspiration for our learning. Sin is the horrible thing which the devil in his fiendish wisdom has brought into the world to defeat the loving purpose of God to make His intelligent creatures sharers of His holiness.

ness and happiness, and any attempt to extenuate its deadliness and horror and damnableness is only so much effort expended to diminish the effect and glory of our Savior's work who came to take away the sin of the world and destroy the works of the devil. When men are once by the grace of God led to see the utter wickedness and detestableness of sin, not merely as an inconvenience and as an impediment in the prosecution of our designs, but as an infernal attempt to dethrone God who is love and deprive the human race of all the blessedness which His love has provided for us all, they cannot think of it so lightly as to let any circumstances or any conditions prevent them from pronouncing their condemnation on it, approximating, according to the extent of their power, the unabridged and unconditioned condemnation which God puts upon it. The Christian, if he is such in reality by repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, condemns sin wherever it appears. Least of all does he make of himself an exception. Rather first of all does he condemn the sin in himself, and in his personal endowment with power from on high has so little sympathy with his sinful nature that he not only refuses to fellowship it, but in accordance with the dictates of the Holy Spirit crucifies it and mortifies the deeds of the body. But how can a Christian condemn sin as it manifests itself in him without condemning the same sin as it manifests itself in others? And how can any one be indifferent to sin as it manifests itself in others without being indifferent to the same sin as it becomes manifest in himself? The question is one that pertains to each individual's own salvation and to the salvation of millions of souls purchased by the precious blood of the incarnate Son of God. How then is it possible that sincere believers in Jesus should treat it lightly and let a heartless Rationalism or a maudlin Sentimentalism shove aside the earnest teachings and remonstrances and admonitions of the Holy Scriptures to make room for the wisdom of the world as against the wisdom of God, for the charity of nature as against the love which the Holy Spirit works by faith, and ultimately for nature in sin as against grace in Christ and His righteousness? Such questions call to remembrance some things of infinite moment that are but

too often treated as insignificant even by professed believers in Christ, and we urge attention to them, lest we forget!

In the light of these things we hope that the ways of the Lutheran Church will be better understood. In that light let us read again what our fathers say in the Book of Concord, not overlooking the important Preface to that Book as published in 1580. We give an extract referring to the point before us and beseech Christian readers to give it the consideration to which the Spirit of grace moves, as against the superciliousness and levity with which the flesh is prone to treat it in the false wisdom and false charity which nature inspires. It is there said:

"As to the condemnations, censures and rejections of godless doctrines, and especially of that which has arisen concerning the Lord's Supper, in this our declaration and thorough explanation and decision of controverted articles, these indeed should have been expressly set forth, not only that all should guard against these condemned doctrines, but also for certain other reasons could in no way have been passed by. Thus as it is in no way our design and purpose to condemn those men who err from a certain simplicity of mind, and nevertheless are not blasphemers against the truth of the heavenly doctrine, much less indeed entire churches, which are either under the Roman Empire of the German nation or elsewhere; nay, rather it has been our intention and disposition, in this manner, to openly censure and condemn only the fanatical opinions and their obstinate and blasphemous teachers, which we judge should in no way be tolerated in our dominions, churches, and schools, because these errors conflict with the express Word of God, and that too in such a way that they cannot be reconciled with it. We have also undertaken this for this reason, viz. that all godly persons might be warned concerning diligently avoiding them. For we have no doubt whatever that even in those churches, which have hitherto not agreed with us in all things, many godly and by no means wicked men are found, who follow their own simplicity and do not understand aright the matter itself, but in no way approve the blasphemies which are cast forth against the Holy Supper as it is administered in our churches according to Christ's institution, and with the unanimous approval of all good men is taught.

in accordance with the words of the testament itself. We are also in great hope that if they would be taught aright concerning all these things, the Spirit of the Lord aiding them, they would agree with us, and with our churches and schools, to the infallible truth of God's Word. And assuredly the duty is especially incumbent upon all the theologians and ministers of the Church, that with such moderation as is becoming they teach also from the Word of God those who either from a certain simplicity or ignorance have erred from the truth, concerning the peril of their salvation, and that they fortify them against corruptions, lest perhaps while the blind are leaders of the blind all may perish. Wherefore by this writing of ours we testify in the sight of Almighty God and before the entire Church that it has never been our purpose by means of this godly formula for union to occasion trouble or danger to the godly who to-day are suffering persecution. For as, moved by Christian love we have already entered into the fellowship of grief with them, so we are shocked at the persecution and most grievous tyranny which with such severity is exercised against these poor men, and sincerely detest it."

How different is all this in its humble reverence for the Word of God and its loving concern for the salvation of souls in the way which He has appointed, and therefore the only way possible, from the self-conceited and flippant treatment of doctrinal differences among modern unionists and their consequent supercilious sneer at the charity that stands in awe of the Divine Majesty, and is unattested by the sentimental feelings and whinings of nature in its self-conceited opposition to the clear requirements of His Word. If it were a matter of politeness and courtesy we might side with the culture of our day against the unpolished methods of reformation times; if it were a matter of learning in regard to the created powers of nature, which were placed under man's dominion and which he was commanded to subdue, we might side with the science of our day in its undeniable advancement as against the limited learning of Luther's day: but if it is a matter of grace as against nature, of supernatural revelation in Christ recorded in Holy Scriptures as against the science of earth and air and sky, and the poetry of flowers, and birds and stars, we desire to sit with our fathers at Jesus'

feet and rejoice in the hope of glory which He gives by the Spirit, rather than to revel in the achievements of the natural mind that perishes in its sin with all its pride and pomp and all its science and poetry. We are lost in sin, and have everlasting death with all its horrors of banishment from God into outer darkness in prospect: what must we do to be saved? That question no science of nature and no gush of sentiment and no flight of imagination can answer, but is answered only by the revelation which the Spirit of God gives us in the Scriptures. That answer our fathers by the grace of God appreciated and rejoiced in, and cordially confessed as the truth unto their salvation and the salvation of all men. It was their only hope, and without the light of science in its earliest age or in the sixteenth or in the nineteenth century, which could afford no help whether they knew it or did not know it, they knew it to be the only hope of all the fallen world. The grace in which they found peace and comfort, was not meant only for them, but for all men, and therefore in their confidence in the Word which revealed it they asserted it and confessed it as the way of the Lord for the rescue from sin and death of all our fallen race. The truth which the Lutheran Church confesses is the truth revealed in Holy Scripture for the salvation of all men, and our fathers, realizing this by faith, could recognize no other way of salvation and make no concessions to religionists or scientists or dreamers who devised some other way. And they could make concessions just as little to those who on principles of natural knowledge and feeling sought to conform the words of Scripture to their natural data, as to those who denied the reality and truthfulness of a supernatural revelation. Those who know what is written for our learning in the Bible, though they know little or nothing of the wonderful discoveries which science has made — discoveries which but too often miss the main truth which the higher criticism has made in its desperate efforts to reduce the authority of the Bible to a natural basis, — know more of the truth unto salvation, though they be simple believers who make no pretensions to learning, than all the science and philosophy and scholarship that refuses to recognize and make account of the supernatural revelation given in Holy Scripture has accumulated in all the ages. Not nature, but

the Bible makes us wise unto salvation; not the powers of nature that may at best bring forth a show of good works to the natural mind and lead to a delusive conceit of their merit, but the powers of grace that work faith in the Lord Jesus unto the forgiveness of sins and purification of the heart rescues us from death and makes us heirs of eternal life.

To preserve and propagate this truth in Jesus unto the saving of human souls that are all otherwise lost is the great work of the Church which Christ has purchased and sanctified. If that great work is done it matters comparatively little what else is done or left undone. In proportion as that truth is promulgated and maintained, the Church will prosper, however much the flesh may complain of bigotry or uncharitableness; in proportion as that truth is sacrificed or compromised, however much the flesh may jubilate over the imaginary victory of liberality and charity, souls are imperilled and the Church suffers. "Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it."

It is not denominational opinions or sectarian vagaries that we have sought to impress on Christian minds, but fundamental truths in which all believers in the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and in the Holy Scriptures by which He who is the way and the truth and the life is revealed to sinners for their salvation, are equally concerned. All the more because the current of the times and the drift of thought is against them have we sought to bring them to mind again and to stir up the pure hearts of Christian people by way of remembrance — lest we forget, lest we forget!

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE AUTHOR of this Epistle, as shown not only by the very beginning but the entire contents, is *Paul*, of whose life and work the Acts of the Apostles in their second half give us a vivid description. Tradition, too, is unanimous

with regard to the authorship; and not even modern criticism, with only one or two solitary exceptions, has dared to call it in question.

THE ROMAN CONGREGATION, to whom the Epistle is addressed, did not owe its *origin* to the immediate activity of any Apostle. Later tradition, indeed, beginning with Dionysius of Corinth (A. D. 170), ascribes its foundation to *Peter*. But no trace of this is found in the *Acts*; nor in Paul's Epistles. And whilst an argument based upon the silence of a document regarding a certain event is not always conclusive, here it is so of a necessity. If Peter had founded the congregation at Rome, Paul would not even have written his Epistle at all, since it was his maxim, as that of the Apostles in general, *not to preach the Gospel where Christ was already named*, so that he might not build upon another man's foundation (Rom. 15, 20). Least of all could he have written what he did write 1, 5. 6; 1, 11-13; 15, 22 sq., looking upon the congregation at Rome as belonging to his territory, and longing for many years to come to them, to comfort and to strengthen them. And if Peter had been connected with the congregation at Rome, or had even, as Roman tradition affirms, been bishop of that part of the Church for years, Paul certainly would have mentioned his name, both in this letter to Rome and in the letters from Rome that he wrote when a prisoner there. Nothing has ever been adduced, or can be adduced, to invalidate this argument. The Church at Rome, not founded by an Apostle, perhaps, owed its first origin to those "sojourners from Rome", *Acts 2, 10*, that were eye and ear witnesses of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost at the first Christian Pentecost. The communication between Rome, then the capital of the world, and Palestine was certainly such that it would be something marvellous if the Gospel had not been brought there at an early date. — Naturally, the first members of the congregation are supposed to have been of Jewish origin; but the fact that Paul, the Apostle of the gentiles, claims them as belonging to his territory (1, 5. 6. 13; 11, 13; 15, 15. 16; 16, 4; comp. Gal. 2, 7 sqq.), shows that, when his Epistle was written, the bulk consisted of gentile Christians.

THE OBJECT of the Epistle is stated by Paul himself (1, 11-15; 15, 22-32): it was, to announce his coming to Rome, and to prepare the congregation there to become the suitable basis for carrying the Gospel westward, and hence to supply what the congregation, because of its origin, lacked

in the knowledge of saving truth. Thus this Epistle is the most systematic and complete of all the Epistles of St. Paul: a presentation of the divine counsel of grace and salvation in its universality, and at the same time a vindication of Paul's ministry and work.

THE DATE AND PLACE of the composition of this Epistle can be gathered from Acts 20, 2. 3; Rom. 16, 1. 2. 23; 1 Cor. 1, 14: it took place during Paul's stay at Corinth in the winter of A. D. 58-59; when navigation, stopped in winter, opened again, both, Phœbe and Paul could think of leaving soon.

DIVISION. I. INTRODUCTION (1, .1-17), containing the *salutation* (vv. 1-7) and the *introduction proper* (vv. 8-15), together with the *subject* (vv. 16. 17). — II. DOCTRINAL PART (1, 18-11, 36): A. *All men are shown to stand in need of the righteousness of God, or justification* (1, 18-3, 20): a. the *Gentiles* (1, 18-32); b. the *Jews* (2 1-3, 20). B. *The essence and natural consequences of the righteousness of God are described* (3, 21-8, 39): a. this righteousness, which is explained *dogmatically* (3, 21-31) and *historically* (4, 1-25), *insures to us eternal life and salvation* (5, 1-21); b. its *natural result* is a *holy life* (6-8): he who is justified, has *died with Christ unto sin*, and hence no more serves sin (6); together with Christ he has also *died unto the law* that, because of the flesh, was to him only an occasion for sinning (7); he *lives in the Spirit* who assures him of eternal salvation, notwithstanding all temporal afflictions (8). C. *It is shown that the fate of the Jewish people is not in conflict with the doctrine of the Epistle* (9-11): a. it does not contradict the *promises of God* that recognize no human claims of any sort (9); b. the *Jews themselves are the cause of their rejection*, by their *pertinacious unbelief* (10); c. the *promises of God*, properly understood, *are also fulfilled with them* (11). — III. PRACTICAL PART (12, 1-15, 13): exhortation to *modest humility, charity, obedience, holy life* in general (12, 13); to correct behavior in *things indifferent in themselves* (14, 1-15, 13). — IV. CONCLUSION (15, 14-16, 27): *justification* of writing (15, 14-21); *hope* to see them (vv. 22-33); *commendation* of Phœbe (16, 1. 2); *greetings* (vv. 3-16); *warning* against *false teachers* (vv. 17-20); *communication of greetings* (vv. 21-23); *doxology* (vv. 25-27).

I. INTRODUCTION: I. 1-17.

A. Salutation: I. 1-7.

According to Greek and Roman fashion the writer of the Epistle introduces himself by name, wishing joy and happiness to those whom he addresses. Paul, however, always enlarges and amplifies, and Christianizes the customary form, as also the introductions of his other epistles show; but nowhere he does this to such an extent as in this case, where he has to introduce himself, explaining his office, and his authority to address them. As Apostle of the gentiles he uses, here as elsewhere, his Roman name, Paul (Acts 13, 9), designating himself the *bond-servant* of *Christ*, the Messiah that has appeared in the person of *Jesus*, the Son of Mary, since he, not only in common with every Christian but also by virtue of his special office, is devoted, soul and body, to his Master's service, and entirely dependent on Him. Then he also mentions the special office that has been conferred upon him by a legitimate call, viz., that of an *apostle* (Matt. 10, 2), a man specially selected to bring the glad tidings of a God-sent Savior to sin-lost men (1; comp. Acts 9, 15); tidings whose saving contents God already in the Old Testament had announced through the inspired writings of His prophets (2). Glad tidings these are, since they speak of His only Son who, indeed has become a true man (Heb. 2, 14), a descendant of David (3; Luke 1, 27. 32; 3, 23 sqq.; 18, 38), but at the same time has a superhuman, essentially-holy, Spirit-nature, according to which He is the majestic, almighty Son of God, solemnly proclaimed as such by His resurrection from the dead, this divine proof of His being what He claimed to be (John 2, 18. 19), and at the same time the earnest of our own happy resurrection, He being Jesus in whom the Messiah has appeared, the Deliverer of the human race from the power of Satan, sin, and death (4; comp. 1 Cor. 15, 12 sqq.). And this divine-human Redeemer it is that has given Paul grace in general and in special the office of an apostle to labor among the Gentiles (Gal. 2, 7 sqq.), to cause them to submit to faith in Christ (Acts 6, 7) as the ruling principle of their life, and thus to promote the honor and glory of Him who has revealed Himself as our Savior (5). And since the Roman Christians in their majority also had belonged to these Gentiles, having by the Gospel been called out of their former idol-

atry and made the happy subjects of Jesus the Messiah (6), Paul had not simply the right, but also the duty of doing what he could to bring them the Gospel more fully; and hence he addressed this Epistle to them. In the very beginning now he wishes them, and all of them, being by faith partakers of God's unspeakable love to all men, and being made holy by receiving the holiness and righteousness of Christ offered in the Gospel, first, *grace*, the foundation and source of every good gift, and secondly, *peace*, peace with God, and as a necessary result, true happiness and welfare in every direction (Luke 1, 79; John 14, 27). And this grace and peace proceeds from God, who in Christ has become our Father, and Christ Himself, who, appearing in Jesus of Nazareth, by His vicarious life, sufferings, and death redeemed us from sin and the power of Satan and thus made us His own blessed property. Thus God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ are equally the source of our salvation and all that pertains to it (7).

B. *Introduction proper: I. 8-17.*

In the first place Paul, as is his wont (comp. 1 Cor. 1, 4 sqq.; 2 Cor. 1, 3 sqq.; Eph. 1, 3 sqq., etc.), thanks God for what He has done for his readers, thus rendering unto God what is due Him, and at the same time predisposing his readers to giving heed to what he has to say. He gives thanks to *his* God, to that God whose happy child and faithful servant he is. He gives thanks through Jesus the Messiah without whose mediation nothing on our part, not even our prayers, can be acceptable to God, as we also, as a rule, acknowledge in our prayers. And he gives thanks for all of his readers, being happy that he knows of no one whom he need except. The subject and cause of his thanksgiving is that their faith in Christ, as manifested by their whole life, was spoken of everywhere, intelligence of anything remarkable spreading from Rome, the capital of the world, to every part of it (8). And this he can in truth say of himself, since that God in whose service in spreading the Gospel of Christ he is with his whole heart is his witness how unceasingly he remembers them, always in his prayers asking God whether it be not His will to grant him at last the good fortune of meeting them (9, 10). For he has a longing to see them, in order to be of some service to them in ministering to their spiritual wants, so that they may be strengthened in their faith (11) and he at the same

time may also be benefitted by being comforted and encouraged together with them in their midst by the exercise of their common faith toward each other (12). But he wants his beloved fellow-Christians to know that he not simply has a longing to see them, but often already had formed the purpose to follow out his desire, in order that, as Apostle of the gentiles, he might prove himself a successful worker also among them, being of some use and help to them towards gaining the heavenly goal; that, however, he could not carry out his purpose because of the more urgent need of preaching the Gospel to those who as yet did not hear it at all (13; comp. 15, 22, 23). Considering himself under obligation, by virtue of his office, to preach the Gospel to all classes of men, especially the gentiles, whether they enjoy the benefits of Greek language and culture, or not, whether they belong to the educated, or not (14): so far as his willingness is concerned there is nothing to prevent him from performing his office also at Rome (15). For not even there, at the capital of the world with all its splendor, riches, and learning, will he be ashamed of the Gospel, since it contains and offers what infinitely surpasses all earthly treasures, the grace of God and the merits of Christ, and hence as a means of divine grace, can do what no man or creature, but only God, is able to do, namely, save man eternally; and it can save every man, if he simply by faith receives what is offered him gratuitously, whatever his condition otherwise may be, whether by natural descent he be a member of the Old Testament people of God, to whom Christ was promised and sent in the first place, or not (16). For in it, and in it alone, that righteousness is revealed and offered that, because of God's holiness and righteousness, every man must possess who wants to be saved; a righteousness that is only God's since only God can bestow it upon man, and that He sent His Son to acquire for all men; a righteousness that on the part of man requires nothing but faith, faith in Christ and His merits to receive it, faith to enjoy and to keep it, as already the Old Testament teaches (Hab. 2, 4; comp. Gal. 3, 11; Heb. 10, 38) that righteousness and life are only by faith in the grace of God (17).

II. DOCTRINAL PART: I. 18–XI. 36.

The Gentiles stand in need of the Righteousness of God:
I 18-32.

Without the revelation of the righteousness of God in and by the Gospel there is only another, a terrible, revelation, namely, that of the wrath, the holy displeasure and righteous vengeance, of God, the Almighty Ruler of the universe. This wrath, revealed in manifold punishments (comp. vv. 24 sqq.), is directed against, and extends over, all the sins of men that by a life in unrighteousness keep back from exerting itself, render ineffective, the knowledge of God that they have by nature, whether these sins be directed against God immediately, or against men (18). Such a knowledge of God every man has, also the heathen, because God has revealed Himself to every one as far as He is known, and can be known, by nature, aside from supernatural, miraculous revelation (19). To be sure, His essence with its various attributes in itself is invisible; but since the creation of the world it can be seen clearly, being perceived and gathered from His manifold works. And this is the case not only with regard to His eternal, never-changing, power in the midst of ever-recurring changes in all that surrounds us, but also with regard to His divine, superhuman nature in general: reason, contemplating the works of creation, cannot but draw the conclusion that there is in existence not simply an eternal power but also a supreme rational Being wisely wielding this power. Where a man has not this knowledge, he has lost it by hardening himself against manifest truth; for it was given every man by nature, so that he might seek to know more of that Supreme Being (Acts 17, 27), or, in case he did not make the proper use of this light of nature, have no excuse (20). For, if he act as the heathen have done, he acts contrary to the knowledge of God given by nature, and hence is inexcusable. The heathen, indeed, though originally having that knowledge of God, neither in general duly honored Him nor even in particular thanked Him for the manifold blessings received; but, as a punishment for their reckless conduct, they lost themselves in vain, deceitful notions concerning God, and their senseless heart, rejecting the true knowledge of God, became more and more the prey of the prince of darkness (21; comp. Eph. 4, 18). Thus, glorying in their supposed wisdom, they became ever more foolish.

(22), as is seen especially in their stupid idolatry, which consisted in exchanging the worship of the majestic, eternal God for that of supposed gods that were held to have the likeness of, or to dwell in, frail, mortal men or even animals of various kinds (23). And their punishment was that God, whom they thus dishonored, in just and holy anger withdrew from them His grace, so that, following the vile lusts of their corrupt hearts, they fell into uncleanness of the grossest kind, and thus their own bodies were dishonored (24). For they were men that exchanged the true God, as revealed to them by nature, for false, fictitious gods, and gave the honor and service due to the ever-to-be-praised Creator of the universe to things created, as the heavenly bodies, the elements, eminent men, and the like (v. 25). For this unnatural religious perversion God gave them up to unnatural moral perversion, a depraved religion being always followed by depraved morals: in their vile, shameful passions women, naturally the more modest sex, as well as men exchanged the natural use of sex, in married life, to an unnatural one, committing moral atrocities that we dare not even mention, thus deservedly harvesting in the moral field the seed sown in the religious (26, 27). And, in general, the heathen, not deeming the true God worthy to be retained and possessed in true, living knowledge, He, in just retribution, gave them up into an unworthy mind, to do things that they themselves knew not to be becoming and proper (28). For their whole life, in thoughts and desires, words, and deeds, was devoted to sin in the most various forms, directed against God and men, their fellowmen in general and even those that ought to be the object of special love and affection (29-31). And thus they acted, although by their conscience (2, 15) they knew full well the just decision of God that those who practice such things have nothing else to expect but death in its various forms, separation from God, the only source of true life and happiness, in time and eternity; and still they did not merely do this themselves, "under the pressure of temptation and in the heat of passion," but even coolly and deliberately approved it in others — the very depth of moral depravation (32).

V. 23. *Man*: as the Greeks and Romans; *birds*, etc.: as the Egyptians (*Ibis*, *Apis*, *serpents*).

V. 29 sqq. *Debate*: strife, quarrel; *whisperers*: secret slanderers; *back-biters*: in general; *haters of God*: evidently here, in this list of sins, more fitting than *hateful to God*, though this is the usual meaning; *despiteful*: insolent; *covenant breakers*: faithless in general.

Also the Jews Stand in Need of the Righteousness of God: II. 1-III. 20.

A. *The Jews are Sinners just as well as the Gentiles, and hence also subject to the Wrath and Punishment of God:* II. 1-10.

If the heathen, notwithstanding their ignorance and blindness, deserved as it is, are without excuse for their transgression of the will of God, certainly men that have a better knowledge and show this by judging the conduct of the heathen, cannot lay claim to any excuse, if they also sin. And this was the case with the Jews, possessing as they did, the supernatural revelation given through Moses: they especially were given to judging and even despising others who did not enjoy the same privileges and blessings. By judging men of an entirely different condition they in reality condemned themselves, since they as well were transgressors of the divine will, though not always in the same, gross and coarse, form (1). And they as well as Paul knew that the judgment of God is always based, not upon appearances and pretences, but upon the true facts, and hence must condemn those that themselves live in sin, however much they may talk about, and judge, the sins of others (2). And, hence, if a Jew expected to be the very person that would escape the judgment of God, because he judged others, though he was a transgressor as well, he was certainly greatly mistaken (3); just as he would be mistaken if he supposed that the unspeakable kindness, patience, and long-suffering of God over against his sins, enjoyed up to the present time, could be regarded as sanctioning his sinful life and shielding him from the judgment to come, since that would be despising that kindness which is intended to lead a man to see his own unworthiness and hence to turn to God in true repentance (4). A man that would lay such a deceptive unction to his soul would, by thus hardening his heart against the love of God and remaining in his impenitent condition, at last find a treasure awaiting him entirely different from the riches of divine kindness and patience enjoyed formerly, a treasure gathered by himself and for himself: on the day of final judgment when the holy wrath of God against all sin and iniquity, and His righteous judgment with regard to all men will be fully revealed, wrath and punishment will be his lot (5). For then God, whose dealings with men here on earth we very often cannot understand, will give to every

one his dues, according to his works (6): eternal life and happiness to those who, in the way appointed by God Himself, by His grace and power accepted in true faith patiently continuing in a life devoted to His service, strive for glory and honor and immortality (7); but to those whose very nature is selfishness, careless of God's will and the neighbor's needs, and who, therefore, disregard the truth revealed by God and become obedient servants of unrighteousness (comp. 1, 18), the fullest measure of His holy wrath (8). This general rule applies both to the Jews and to the gentiles, not only to the latter, but also to the former; yea, to the former in the first place, since they were the covenant people of the Old Testament to whom Christ and salvation was promised and sent in the first place (9. 10; comp. Luke 12, 47. 48).

B. *Not simply to have the Law, but to keep it, is what is required, also of the Jews:* II. 11-29.

Both Jews and gentiles will be dealt with in accordance with their works. For no respect of person, no regard to the *external* condition of a man, no partiality is found with God, the righteous Judge (11). Whoever has sinned, is subject to punishment: if he be without the Law given through Moses, or a heathen, he will also be punished without regard to that Law, simply according to the natural law found in his heart; if he be within the sphere and domain, in the possession, of the revealed Law, this Law will be the norm of his judgment (12). For not the hearing of the Law, which was to be found with the Jews in their synagogues, but the doing of it makes a man righteous in the judgment of God (13). This, in a manner, also applies to the gentiles. Certainly, they have not the Law given to Israel through Moses; but when men that belong to them, in their natural condition, unaided by supernatural revelation, do what the Law requires, at least in part and externally, they show that there is something in them that tells them what the Law

V. 8. *Indignation and wrath:* the former, *δρυγή*, is active and lasting, the effect and expression of the latter, *θυμός*, which is the emotional, passing anger, boiling up suddenly and subsiding soon.

V. 9. *Tribulation and anguish:* the effect of the divine *indignation and wrath* upon the *soul*, the sensible part of man, the former from without, the latter from within.

V. 10. *Glory* refers to the *appearance; honor*, to the *estimation and condition; peace*, to the *relation* between God and man, the foundation source of all true happiness.

tells the Jews (14). Yea, by their very actions they prove that what the Law requires, if not announced to them on tables of stone, as it was to the Jews (Ex. 31, 18), is written in their moral consciousness, even if by the fall and subsequent sin this writing has lost a good deal of its original clearness and legibility. That there is such a natural law engraven in the heart of the heathen, is also, besides the testimony of their external actions, testified to by their conscience, this divine judge of moral actions in the heart of every man, ineradicable, proof against every bribe, though not infallible, because dependent on the moral knowledge of man. Also the thoughts that are called forth by the judgment of the conscience and that among each other as a rule accuse, sometimes also excuse and defend, the actions, bear witness to the existence of a natural law in the heart (15). And that conscience is active in this way, also in the case of heathens, will become entirely manifest on the day of final judgment, when, what is hidden in the breast of man, unknown to his fellow-men, will be brought to light through Him who, as revealed in the Gospel, is appointed by God the judge of the universe, the Christ who has appeared in Jesus of Nazareth (16; comp. John 5, 27; Acts 17, 31).

Thus every man will be judged according to his deeds, the Jew no less than the gentile. A Jew, indeed, bears a name honorable above all heathen names, indicating his being a member of the people of the covenant; he makes a law, yea, the Law of God, the foundation of his confidence and hope, and glories in knowing and worshiping the true God (17; comp. Eph. 2, 12); he is acquainted with the will of God, being taught the Law, and hence is able to discern between right and wrong (18); he also regards himself the proper person to instruct others that do not enjoy the same privileges with him, since in the Law he has that form of religious knowledge and divine truth which it pleased God to reveal in the Old Testament (19, 20). But if now he, who is thus favored above the heathen and not rarely boasts of it in a way that savors of self-conceit, does not do himself what he teaches others, but the very opposite, does he not, just by glorying in the Law and at the same time transgressing it, dishonor God, causing the heathen to think lightly and to speak reproachfully of a God whose professed fol-

lowers and favorites act in such a way (21-24)? Consequently his mere knowledge of the Law cannot exempt him from the general rule that everyone will be judged according to his deeds. Nor can circumcision shield him. It is, indeed, of great use as the entrance, so to say, to the Old Testament covenant of God with all its privileges and blessings; but in reality it truly benefits only that man who lives up to the conditions and requirements of that covenant; that is, keeps the Law. If a man does not do that, on the contrary transgresses the Law, he has, despite his circumcision, no more share in the blessings of the covenant than an uncircumcised heathen (v. 25). Hence, supposing, what never takes place (3, 20), that a heathen without circumcision did live up to the righteous requirements of the Law, he would surely receive the same blessings as if he were a circumcised Jew (26), and moreover show by his conduct how culpable he is who transgresses the Law, although he enjoys the privilege of having it in its complete, written form, and by circumcision has been made a member of the people of the covenant (27). For nothing that is simply external is decisive in the judgment of God. To be a Jew and to be circumcised merely externally is not what God wants, does not make a true member of the people of God (28); the correct condition of the heart, regeneration and sanctification of the soul, brought about only by the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, and not by the mere outward letter of the Law, this is necessary to receive the praise that decides man's eternal fate, the praise not of short-sighted, flattering men, but of an omniscient and holy God (29). — Hence, the merely external possession of the Law and of circumcision on the part of the Jews is no valid refutation of the Apostle's assertion that they, being sinners, are subject to the wrath and judgment of God, and hence stand in need of the righteousness of God no less than the gentiles.

V. 22. *Commit sacrilege*: robbing (heathen) temples is the usual meaning of the Greek word (*τεροσυλέω*), and the only one that fits the context: the man who professes to have a horror for idols does not scruple to enter their temples to rob them of their valuables. That such a thing assured among the Jews, is apparent from *Acts XIX. 37*, as also from Jewish writers, e. g. *Josephus (Ant. IV. 8-10)*.

THE LEAGUE STATUS IN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. E. CRONENWETT, A. M., BUTLER, PA.

Opinions respecting the Luther League movement widely diverge; perhaps, because of lack or varying degree of appreciation of a problem involved: — its rightful call and commission, place and standing in the Church — including the polity and policy of its measures and trend. In places — it carries by storm, elsewhere it meets with conservative reception — whilst some even seriously challenge it. In the domains of the General Synod and General Council — where the League movement first took root and rapidly spread in inter-synodical interlacings — we find it, however, a far different project than among us. How the former is viewed by its advocates, what it is and is expected from it, is told in the published League Reports. The motives assigned for the movement and the objects in view were discussed at length in the earlier League conventions. A digest of positions taken and arguments adduced from such earlier copies of the League Review as are by chance at hand, shall here be presented, somewhat in extenso, for full satisfaction from original sources.

I.**THE LUTHER LEAGUE MOVEMENT AS INTER-SYNODICAL FEDERATION AT LARGE.**

A. *From a General Synod view-point as to its ultimate trend.*

Pertinent in this direction is an address delivered by the Rev. J. W. Schwartz, D. D., at a Central League Convention in Kittanning, Pa., in 1894. It affirmatively answers the Question:

“Is the Luther League advisable?”

The Rev. speaker, in part, said:

“As there are some of our own household of faith who believe that a Luther League is not advisable, and give

what seem very plausible reasons for so thinking, the following reasons are given for the opinion that a Luther League is advisable.

"1. Because it serves to nourish a warmer love for, and a just pride in, our own denomination. . . . There is no denomination that has so grand a history, so pure a system of doctrine, so large a membership as ours has. . . . No one can study with unbiased mind our record as to history and doctrine and fail to honor our Church for both. . . .

"2. Because by such a movement as this the different wings of our Church come to know and hence to have a kinder regard for each other. . . . In such a convention as this we forget what divides us and think and talk more of what things we have in common. . . .

"3. Because such an organization as this is a step toward the unity of these various wings of our denomination. Perhaps I should rather have said it is a practical illustration of the kind of unity we should look for. I am one of those who believe that it is neither practicable nor desirable that the different portions of our Church should ever come together in organic union. The things that divide us are not so small that they can be lost sight of, nor so trifling that they can be brushed aside with a wave of the hand. We have differed — may I say radically differed? We do differ still, and unless times and men change very much more than we have reason to expect they will, we, and those who come after us, shall continue to differ just as radically. . . . Each is conscientious in its tenacity, and so it seems to me that there never will be an organic unity of all these parts. . . . If that cannot be, we can at least unite in this way — form a federation, a league — and so find some common ground on which we can stand and work together. This, as I understand it, is the aim of this movement. . . . Each one is just as much at liberty to have his own views of the doctrines or usages of our Church while in the League as out of it. What we want to accomplish by this movement is to show our strength as a denomination without any one compromising himself in matters in which he cannot yield.

"4. Because such an organization is a step toward the unity of the whole orthodox Christian Church. . . . I do not believe that Christian unity will ever on earth assume an organic form. I believe that denominationalism — not sectarianism — shall continue to the end of time. But there will be unity nevertheless. It will be an " *E pluribus unum*" — "distinct as the billows, but one as the sea." Toward this consummation — Christian unity in one form or another — the eyes of the Christian world are turning more and more longingly as the years roll on. . . . Now such a result can be very materially hastened by a movement like this. When parts of the Church bearing the same denominational name can meet and greet each other, can fraternize — fellowship — there is here assuredly something done toward paving the way for a larger fellowship — the 'communion of saints' — on a broader platform. And this to my mind is a very good reason why a Luther League is advisable.

"5. Because this work of drawing closer together is beginning at the right place — with the young. This organization is preëminently a young people's association. It is a League of Lutheran young Christian societies of whatever name. And this is one of its most excellent features. When we become well advanced in life we are very firmly settled in our ways of thinking. Especially is this true if these opinions were formed years ago in the midst of a bitter conflict. . . . If, as has been suggested, the things that divide us are too important to be given up, if we cannot agree, we can at least disagree in a friendly spirit, and there is more hope of finding such a spirit among the young people, or of begetting it, if it does not already exist, than among the older ones. For this reason a Luther League is desirable."

B. *The Lutheran healthiness of the argument and cause — as advocated — questioned.*

I. The salient positions sought out.

This argument in favor of the Luther League, from a General Synod view-point, starts in praise of our Lutheran heritage and reaches its climax in the glorification of uni-

versal unionism. a) A wide denominational distinction is made in favor of Lutheranism: "No denomination has so grand a history, so pure a system of doctrine, . . . as ours has." "We can give answer to every one that asks us a reason for our being." "What we want to accomplish by this movement is to show our strength as a denomination." Moreover, "We are not ashamed to let the world know that we exist and for what we stand." b) The fact is, however, emphasized that, matters of import mark party lines between divisions in the Lutheran Church. "The things that divide us are not so small that they can be lost sight of." The position is assumed that the differences are "radical," — "are too important to be given up." Further we are informed that "Each of the several parties clings tenaciously to its own views of the questions that separate," and that "Each is conscientious in its tenacity." Nevertheless, though, "whilst we commune with each other about our common heritage, we get clearer views of that history and doctrine and membership; and in this way our love for our Church is strengthened," and though, "By such a movement as this the different wings of our Church come to know and hence have a kinder regard for each other" — and notwithstanding the conflicting differences all around — as burden of the plea, c) inter-synodical and inter-denominational union at large, under retention of divergent characteristic confessional distinctions, is unreservedly advocated — and, as trending toward this goal, the Luther League is complacently commended.

2. The Trend defined.

Promising possibilities are seen lurking in this movement, "Because this work of drawing together is beginning in the right place — with the young." This is pronounced "one of its most excellent features." The policy is to "form a confederation, — a league — and so find a common ground on which we can stand and work together." However, the design is not that it shall be a Lutheran parliament and training school in the direction of truer confessional discrimination and consistency. — For, "In such a convention we forget what divides us and think and talk more of what things we have in common; without any one compromising himself in matters in which he cannot yield."

But it is to be regarded as "A practical illustration of the kind of unity we should look for"; "A step toward the unity of the whole orthodox Christian Church"; "on a broader platform"; — "an 'E pluribus unum' — distinct as the billows, but one as the sea."

"Toward this goal" — the argument continues — "Christian unity in one form or another — the eyes of the Christian world are turning more and more longingly as the years roll on. The churches are, beyond all question, coming closer to each other, and while each one holds its distinctive features of doctrine, government, or form of service, each regards the other with a far more fraternal spirit than was cherished even so lately as half a century ago. Now such a result can be very materially hastened by a movement like this."

3. Direction of the Trend.

There is observable drifting in our times among denominations, primarily — away from ancestral lines, and, possibly, away from Scripture certainty. Where it is, here and there, toward the kernel of the Word, it is toward the heart of our faith. Toward what sort of unity, however, the drift, in general, trends, a few allusions will show. The American Episcopal Church has virtually cast adrift its thirty-nine Articles — as rallying-ground of faith — and is disposed to content itself with the Nicene Creed as sole unifying Confession of faith. This, together with the Scriptures, the two Sacraments, and — last, but not least — an "historic Episcopate", is proposed on their part as basis of Church unity. Aside from the definitions of the Nicene Creed and Monarchical Episcopacy — in what light Scripture and Sacraments are to be viewed, and what is to be held and taught as body of Christian doctrine, shall be left an open question. Among Presbyterians a loud clamor is heard for revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith — and conservative hesitation has been prompted, in part, not so much from desire to retain certain distinctively Christian features, pointed out as objectionable, as from apprehensiveness as to — revision once begun — where it will end. Briggism was felt to be abroad. Significant in another direction is, that the bars against worldly amusements are also somewhat let down among them; and this

likewise applies elsewhere. A portion of the Church, under colors of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, sails wide of confessional Lutheranism. Prominent Methodism, setting the pace, has long since left behind the evangelical devoutness of a Wesley and points to doctrinal latitudinarianism as its distinguishing glory. Yes, the churches are drifting. And where the popular drift carries the pulpits with it — it is toward anything but scriptural theology.

A prominent religious journal from its view-point puts it thus: "It is not enough to characterize general theology as narrow, chaotic, antique, mediæval, and inefficient; we must add that it fails in its representation of absolute truth, and it does not properly symbolize progressive Christian thought." "Wanted — A theology of universalistic properties, adapted to all churches, all schools, all thought, all men." And — barring perhaps some "philosophic" and "scientific" features of statement and form, the author of the article cited subjectively opines that the M. E. Church in substance has the *desideratum* — at least in a workable shape. In general, the religious trend of to-day, as exemplified in "higher criticism," so-called, and "advanced thought", is toward leaving both landmarks and anchor of faith behind — and to sail out into the deep, untrammelled by God-given helm, compass, or chart. The issue is openly raised: how much of the Bible is divine thought, how much human? Pilate's question, reverberating down the ages, finds echo in the schools of to-day: "What is truth?" — Now, what part or lot has Lutheranism in such company?

4. Religious Clubs versus the Church of Christ.

The conception of "Church", on a popular basis, in keeping with "twentieth century thought," seems to be hazily that of: "religious club", embellished with sacred symbols and practicing ancient rites, with platitudes for doctrine, entertainment for worship, and unctuous suavity as the lubricating oil of fellowship — in which however no John the Baptist shall occupy the platform to shock sensibilities or disturb consciences. Perhaps it is therefore — anticipatingly — that churches are already somewhat run on the lines of social clubs of religious usages and proclivities — much after the style of the lodges. Perhaps, also,

the effect of Baal-worship, permeating the churches, is making itself felt in the direction of popular "Church unity," on some common ground. Why not adopt the platform of Free Masonry at once? That system of religion claims for itself paramount "catholicity" and "obliges" the worshipers at its altar "only" — "to that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves."* This would enlarge the scope of fraternization to embrace all "religious societies" — deistic and Christian. And, on theistic basis, what is to hinder individual identification, through actual membership, simultaneously and organically, with several religions — the Church, synagogue, Mosque and lodge? "They all believe in a God!" — Why so narrow and bigoted in religion? — The world would like to know! We are told, from a broad and still broader viewpoint, that there is good in all churches — denominations — religions; all the good is not in one; all have points and ground in common on a sliding scale, from Christ, and the Bible, to belief in God and the Ten Commandments; — and there is the common brotherhood of man!: then why not an open parliament of all religions — and federation, fraternization, inter-fellowship among all? A modern world Church-pantheon? Ah, whither?

5. The prestige of man in the Church over God.

In all unionistic tendencies, the divine fades — the human looms. As with the builders at Babel, unbelief is at the bottom — self at the top. Acceptable common ground supersedes positive conviction, mass-federation ignores faith's distinctions, the arm of man supplants the fear of God. Unionistic Church movements are never Christocentric — ever Christofugal: in the direction of the wheel's spokes away from the center toward the felloes — toward the ever widening circle bordering the outer edge of latitudinarianism. But, on the Rock of Ages founded, stands the Church immutable — and immutably for Christ. Matt. 16, 16-18. In unionistic measures the Church of Christ, divine in institution, character, and office, "the Church of

* Free Mason's Monitor — Webb, ed. by Rob. Morris. Chap. I. Concerning God and Religion; in "The Ancient Charges of Masonry first published in 1723 under the authority of the Grand Lodge of England."

the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," 1 Tim. 3, 15, as bearer of the oracles and steward of the mysteries of God, Rom. 3, 2; 1 Cor. 4, 1, is made to sink into the background; whilst visible church membership, chance incumbency in office and pew, together with related or accidental social features, press to the front. "My sheep hear my voice" — but the ears of unionists itch for popular applause. In this wise, unionistic Church-fellowship — man's overweening relation to man in the Church — overrides and buries out of sight the Church's proper relation to the Lord in her fundamental attitude of humble, adoring homage to God in Christ — her spouse and supreme, sole Head. Thus unionism trenches on holy ground. When Church-fellowship — as fraternization between men — infringes on the Church's fellowship, of faith, with Christ — or feal soul-devotion to Him and His truth — then it approaches the danger-line of Christ-denial — of installing man in the place of God. "He that loveth father or mother" — "son or daughter" — "more than me is not worthy of me." Matt. 10, 37. "Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 10, 33. Hence a scheme of federation that substitutes the fellowship of amity for the fellowship of faith is not in the mind of Christ — and merits Lutheran repudiation.

6. Truth the Standard of agreement.

Yet, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Ps. 133. "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Ephes. 4, 3. Unity among brethren — unity of Spirit-relationship with God in Christ — indeed calls for corresponding fellow-relationship — fraternal love and peace — with man, among believers. But the latter must accord with the former — the former as intricate soul-basis of the latter precedes. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" Amos. 3, 3. Divine truth is the Church's standard of agreement. "We receive and embrace the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure, clear fountains of Israel, which are the only true standard whereby to judge all teachers and doctrines." Form. Conc. Pars. II, 1. "Thy Word is truth." John 17, 17. "Execute the judgment of truth and peace within your

gates." "Love truth and peace." Zech. 8, 16, 19. Truth in God's counsels precedes, conditions, and cements the Church's concord of unity and peace." "Sanctify them through Thy truth." John 17, 17. Except through the sanctification of the truth, there is no "communion of saints."

7. An unfortunate Simile.

However, the Doctor in the course of his address avers: "But there will be unity nevertheless. It will be an 'E pluribus unum' — distinct as the billows, but one as the sea." Is the simile apt? — For the purpose used it is as illusory as the phantom-unity that lures the speaker, and to which he fain would have it apply. His projected Church-union is constituted of radically discordant confessional elements as to its integral denominational parts. The element of sea and wave is one. The sea and its undulations, in the swell and inter-coalescing of its common element, is a homogeneous body formed of like essential particles — globules of salt-water. This is not an incongruous aggregation of intermingled heterogeneous parts. The charming simile aptly illustrates genuine Church-unity, not its caricature — unionism. In like manner the motto: "E pluribus unum," as in the American mind in our day applied to our Commonwealth — "Out of many one" — is also unfortunately used by the worthy Doctor, as expressive of his species of union. Our American Union is not a composite of heterogeneous States; the States and the Union, in spirit, system, institutions, are one. One Country and nation of homogeneous civil principles and polity. Even so is the Church as kingdom and fold of Christ intrinsically homogeneous. In Spirit and in truth, out of every land, nation, kindred, tongue — wherever found — the Church of Christ is one. "I believe in one holy Christian Church." Its unity is faith-unity, its oneness is faith-oneness, in the Spirit, with Christ; its conditions of fellowship, agreement in the truth. This Church-unity is not unionism. Unionism is abortion. The scheme proposed is unionism.

8. Scriptural Unity versus Unionism.

The argument of unity — even on specious basis — carries force. Papal unity is specious — and unionism a

snare. Both lure — blind and bind. When semblance imposes, how peerless the divinely real. But where that, in the ascendent, is accepted as substitute, this is discarded and must wane. Thus Satan — as in Eden — in holy place steals a march on God. And men delight in the delusion. Let us away with imposture, and hold to what God proposes: "One body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism." Eph. 4. It is divine, genuine unity that St. Paul pleads: "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1, 10. That which St. Paul stipulates for the Church at Corinth applies to the Church universal. In this unity the Church is one. In this unity those who are of the one holy Christian Church — in so far as they are of Christ — stand, and must continue to stand. This should be plain to all — and what it involves, especially to divines — who would intelligently call themselves Lutheran. For to this Lutherans subscribe:

"The churches among us" — "teach, That one holy Church is to continue forever," which "is the congregation of saints [the assembly of all believers], in which the Gospel is rightly taught [purely preached], and the Sacraments rightly administered [according to the Gospel]. And to the true unity of the Church, it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites and ceremonies instituted by men, should be alike everywhere; as St. Paul saith: 'There is one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.'" Augs. Conf., Art. VII.

9. Scriptural agreement in Doctrine the essence of Church-unity.

It is not a question of personal predilection that confronts us. The point is, without "mental reservation" — "to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel" — in the honest sense and spirit of our Confessions. These Confessions are our acknowledged interpretation of the terms of unity, and we, in keeping with this understanding — stipulated and defined in our protocol, insist on it that, the prerequisite to Church-fellowship is: "To agree concerning the doctrine."

And this is not a fellowship contingent on deferential suppression of discordant convictions — or an outward agreement merely as to objective truth, "but it is principally a fellowship of faith and the Holy Ghost in hearts." *Apol. Augs. Conf.*, Chap. IV, Art. VII. Thus faith, that is begotten of and abides in the truth, conditions brotherhood in Christ. "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed." *John* 8, 31. All other fraternizing Church-fellowship without it honors not Christ and profits not the soul. Such Christ-brotherhood in faith-unity is the burden of Jesus' intercessory prayer: "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." *John* 17. This is not only possible, but must be fact even as applied to us. And the spirit of yearning that is akin to Jesus' pleading should dispose us to careful examination and conscientious removal of that which, between us and Him and among ourselves, therewith conflicts. Devout conferences with this in view, as advocated by us, would be a step in the right direction. But, conniving in a policy that expeditiously ignores, seems — on the part of those who have risen to its clearer apprehension — like twin to conspiracy against truth.

10. Attainment and Responsibility.

"There is no denomination that has so pure a system of doctrine as ours has" — this is the position taken at the outset of the argument under consideration. Does it warrant the trend of the address? The sequence is scarcely in keeping with the premise. If we have attained to crystal waters at the fountain-head should we recede to keep in company with those who prefer to tarry where the stream is less limpid? — Were it not better for us and our children and truer kindness to them, to beckon to our find and help them climb higher? How shall men be expected to know and prize the matchlessness of our pearl of great price if we keep it buried? — the transcendent clearness of our light if we hide it under a bushel? We serve not truth by courteous silence. What is salt worth if it savors not? Or, does our "so pure a system," after all, lie in what is synodically and inter-denominationally common? If so, why vaunt? If not, why laud abnormal relations to our discount? If the differ-

ences even between us — as is stated — are “too important to be given up” — are “radical” — what of inseparable denominational barriers? Even straws give indications. And significant of the signs of the times is the finding that the spirit of communism is most rife among those who have least to add to a joint stock. It is “Birds of a feather that flock together.”

“Denominationalism” — the Doctor thinks — “shall continue to the end of time,” — and he would fain have it so; yet he hails with delight the Luther League movement as initial measure toward general inter-denominational federation. Now, though — in the providence of God — denominational separation exists, is this — in the design of God — for the purpose of unionism? — Or is it not rather on this wise — that, true to conviction according to the measure of truth realized, God would have the vanguard in the lead of the rearguard? “Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required.” Luke 12, 48.

II. Apostolic Precedent and Precept.

If the Church of the Reformation be the banner-bearer of the Gospel, let it stand by its standard of faith’s pureness, and publish the truth in full to the world. This is Christian duty. “Ye are a chosen generation that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light.” 1 Pet. 2, 9. “What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops.” Matt. 10, 27. This was the course of John Baptist and of his and Christ’s disciples. Andrew, on the former’s testimony, having discovered Jesus, did not suppress the joy. “He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have found the Messias and he brought him to Jesus.” “Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.” “Come, and see.” John 1, 35-46. On this wise the disciples as apostles continued. St. John, 1 Ep. 1, witnesses: “That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be

full." Whilst St. Paul solemnly protests: "I take you to record this day, that I am free from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Acts 20, 26-28. To Timothy his charge is: "Hold fast the form of sound words." "Preach the Word, be instant in season, out of season." 2 Tim. 1, 13; 4, 2. "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." 1 Cor. 4, 2. Consideration of policy, motives of courtesy — respect for man — will never justify unfaithfulness to God.

12. Shall we federate?

Shall we then, mindful of our high calling, responsibility, and the grace vouchsafed us, "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," Jude 3, and to this end steadfastly stand by the apostolic resolve: "Whereunto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing," Philip 3, 16, — or shall we identify ourselves with intersynodical unionism, as advocated, to settle down on a broad — and still broader — platform, till finally even the world itself will not object to fraternize with us? Shall we federate — and encourage our young people thus to federate — or shall we pause? "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread!"

13. Rehoboam's Junior Counsellors. 1 Kings 12.

Moses in grave affairs of Israel sets us this example: "Gather unto me all the elders of your tribes, and your officers," and again: "Ask thy father and he will show thee; thy elders and they will tell thee." Deut. 31, 28; 32, 7. In a grave Church-matter at Antioch, we read: "They determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." Acts 15. Have things in the Church reversed? For the guidance of a movement that holds within its folds the Church of the future — has the mantle of Elijah fallen on the shoulders of the junior laity? The solemn charge: "O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the Word at my mouth, and warn them from me," Ezek. 33, is this now committed to the executives in chief of Lutheran Young People's Societies? Again the reiteration arises: whither tend we? The Lutheran healthiness of the movement —

its Scripturalness stands challenged. In commendation of Abraham God approvingly said: "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord." Gen. 18, 19. Be ours the faith and fidelity of Abraham, the fellowship and approbation of God.

THE GREATER SIN.

BY REV. C. F. W. ALLWARDT, A. B., SHELBYVILLE, ILL.

The difference in yard-sticks and scales has worked much mischief at all times. When the yard-stick and scale of men differ from that of God, the mischief done is all the greater; it means usually great deception to man. The same deed, measured and weighed by man, may be good but measured and weighed by God is found wanting. Our measure and scale is not always a correct indicator.

Likewise in distinguishing between two deeds of the same kind men are liable to make the same mistake. They weigh and measure one sin and compare with another to find "the greater sin." And but too often the idea underlying is that the greater sin is more damnable than the other. Perhaps in many cases the greater sin is found on the part of the neighbor, and not of him that is weighing and making close distinctions. Perhaps in many instances it is a case of seeing very distinctly the mote in a brother's eye and not the beam in one's own eye.

It will not do to weigh in human scales the sins of people with a view to finding the greater sin, against which by all means war must be declared, and the smaller sin against which no crusade is necessary. It may be necessary to preach against one more frequently, because it is a besetting sin, a sin which is so deceptive that on the face of it nothing dangerous is noticeable. It may then be necessary to raise the voice in special warning, so that the flock may watch more closely the wolf clothed in sheep's clothing. The watchman has more need of being on his guard against the lurking, sneaking enemy, than one that comes openly in broad daylight. The latter everybody can see, but the for-

mer not. Yet that would be no reason why there should be no guard to watch all enemies. All sins must be condemned and testified against, but when one certain sin threatens to take the people unawares it becomes necessary to make special efforts to warn against that sin. Still from that it must not be inferred that this is "the greater sin."

We have in mind the criticism with which our treatment of secretists frequently meets. There are not a few persons who charge us with treating this as "the greater sin," while against others we do not agitate with the same earnestness and vigor. And it is so easy to put that construction on our treatment of such people, since in our constitution of the congregation we make special mention of the sin of secrecy; our district synod earnestly impresses upon all congregations the duty of having that clause; in our publications this subject is frequently treated in special articles — in fact, we have instituted a regular crusade against this one sin. That must be "the greater sin."

Nobody will deny that there is room for a distinction between sins. The Scriptures make a distinction, but not in such a way that one unpardonable sin is damnable, while another is not. "He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." John 19, 11. The expression "greater sin" already brands the sin of Pontius Pilate as great, and the better knowledge of the Jews and Judas and their hatred make their sin even greater. Thus no one that sins is excused or promised impunity. Or take the passage Luke 12, 47, 48. Here the Savior says of one servant that he shall be beaten with many stripes and the other with few. The one knew his master's will, the other did not. There was a difference in the sins, and hence in the penalties, but each was followed by punishment.

Matthew 11, 20-24 also clearly shows that the opportunities wasted are quite an item when God metes out justice. The sins of the learned then are greater because they sin in spite of better knowledge. Their sin implies greater malice and persistence, hence it is more grievous. It is done presumptuously, implies contempt of God's word. Numb. 15, 30, 31. Some persons have special opportunities — excellent, pious parents, everything in abundance, pious friends, have often been admonished to repent, and yet live

and die as heathens. Their sin is greater than that of a poor heathen child. A person in high office in Church and state is apt to do much more damage with his sins, because he is watched by so many. One sins wilfully and designedly, while another sins from weakness. One makes *sin* a practice, the other makes *piety* a practice; though he admits that by reason of weakness he sins much. One has been previously warned and instructed, his friends have often pleaded with him, but all to no avail; while another, ignorant of the facts in the case, takes a foolish step unsuspectingly. Evidently there are differences here. But none of these sins, though surrounded by mitigating circumstances, is exempt from damnation.

To rate sins by outward appearance is equally as bad. Murder and murder may be two different sins, inasmuch as one is provoked and the other cold-blooded. Theft and theft may not be the same thing — the one being a vicious habit, while the other is the result of poverty, hunger and cold. The one is a habit, the other is an accident. The one betrays a morbid mind, the other a mind relatively better. The one, though we pity him, also disgusts us, while the other receives a full share of our pity. Humanly speaking the one is a hopeless case, while the other may reform.

But take these and other sins away from persons, and away from all kinds of circumstances and regard them without reference to their effect upon the community, take sin, the transgression of God's law, and we can not make those distinctions. Who could single out "the greater sin" from a long list? Lieing, deceiving, cursing, swearing, drunkenness, gluttony, perjury, neglecting the means of grace, failing to support one's family, etc., all are damnable sins. As soon, however, as you put them together with persons and circumstances they may differ.

Sin is damnable — it is denying the faith. A father who fails to provide for his house, "hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim. 5, 8. Likewise, if he train not his children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, allowing them to grow up ignorant of the way to salvation — the same has also denied the faith. "To do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. 13, 16. But whoever is not

doing these things displeases God; to believe in God and still displease Him is, however, a contradiction. Displease God, and your act implies that you have denied the faith. Sin is dearer to your heart than God. The thief loves his plunder more than God, the drunkard his strong drink, the adulterer his lust, the avaricious his mammon, and so on. And is not secretism a denying of the faith? Men who have no time for the Church, no money, no love, have all these for the lodge, which does not acknowledge the need of Christ the Savior, nor does it confess faith in the triune God, besides many other things. It must be remembered that sins of omission are just as damnable as sins of commission. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." James 4, 17.

What will we do with the denials of these charges? Lodge-men are ever ready to deny. They know the secret workings, since they are inside, at least they ought. Yet many do not see the error of their way. The drunkard ought to know from experience whether it is injurious to be given to excesses. In spite of all his experience, he fails to see it until it is too late. When he has wasted his substance, wrecked his mind, destroyed his digestive organs, broken down his nervous system, when physically and mentally ruined, he may admit it. But then it is too late. The loss of body and mind cannot be repaired. He may be able to reason against the craving for strong drink, but his will power is so completely demoralized that he can offer no resistance. Not God's servant, but the slave of sin! Only divine grace accepted by faith can help him.

The adulterer is in the same boat with the drunkard. Similar is the case of the gambler, who feels most deeply offended when you charge him with dishonesty. He has had an understanding with his playmate and if the latter loses, he has no right to complain. In these and other cases, we do not listen to the testimony of such witnesses, because the evidence against them is strong and convincing.

A sad thing! — so many ministers are in the lodge and help to justify it. And strange to say, people will accept their opinion on the lodge, when on any other question they would not do so. A Lutheran (?) lodge-man may be heard as saying: "Rev. Z., the Baptist minister, sees no wrong

in the lodge." Will he give the same weight to Rev. Z.'s opinion on Baptism, Lord's Supper or Predestination? Surely not. But why single out this one sin and ask Rev. Z.'s opinion, when in all other questions his opinion counts for naught! But such a pastor will no doubt have to answer for "the greater sin." Not because he is a secretist, but because by virtue of his office and the confidence reposed in him, he is leading so many astray.

It does not surprise us, that the above method is pursued. It is not new. The thief does not go to the sain to obtain an opinion regarding his crime. The Pharisee does not compare himself with one who is good and above reproach, but with the publican. His glory is that he is better than other men, notably the publican. Had he sought the distinction of being as meek, sincere and self-sacrificing as John the Baptist or even Christ, and thus admitted "that he had not already attained, neither were already perfect," Phil. 3, 12, he would have been commended for it. However, he sought honor among men, and Christ's words fit his case: "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" John 5, 44. And St. Paul seems to have the same fault in mind, when he writes: "But let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another." Gal. 6, 9. As long as you always notice that you are a little better than one who is evidently not far advanced in holiness, you can have no real rejoicing, as there surely is no great progress. What joy and comfort is there in the fact that you are not as bad as you might be?

Surely this must be the source of so many fatal distinctions. Forgetting that sin is sinful under all circumstance has led many to make the distinction. Remembering that sin is sin as round is round, we will more readily avoid the dizzy height of pride from which so many have fallen. In judging others be charitable, and put the best construction on everything. In judging our own sin let us be severe and consistent so that no loop-hole is left for any "pet sins."

Yet does it not appear as though we proceed with greater severity against the secretist than against any other vice? Does not many a drunkard, thief, perjurer and other

retain a fairly good name, because the church harbors him, while the pious, honest, generous member of the lodge is excluded?

Granting that to some it may thus appear, we deny that this is the actual state of affairs. The Church must have positive evidence before it can charge any person with profanity, avarice, drunkenness, dishonesty or any sin. Yes, before the case ever can come before the Church, it may have been settled in accordance with Matthew 18, 15-17.

It is not unusual for people to talk about Mr. W. having done so and so. Ask them to come along to reprove Mr. W. and they have many excuses. Of course, they do not wish to stir up any quarrel; they would not have Mr. W. know that they said anything. Of course not. So it might happen that the individual members would be well enough informed, but for this or that consideration the matter does not come up for trial, as no plaintiff and no witnesses appear. Without such a trial it would be unjust to condemn him. When a man joins the lodge, appears in parades, displays the charm of the lodge, there can be no doubt as to his guilt. Here we have no suspicion, lacking proof, but here everything is plain.

Secret societies are not mentioned in the Bible, just as original sin is never mentioned. Yet the matter is all there. The Scriptures clearly teach original sin, as well as forbid the methods and objects of secret societies. Hence the attention of the people must be called to them especially. If they were not secret, their work would be better known. Their secrecy calls for special warning. Drunkenness, profanity, worldliness, desecrating the Sabbath, despising the means of grace, absence from the public worship, adultery, failing to support the Church, lying, stealing, secretism, what intelligent Christian would dare single out "the greater sin"? Before God all are bad. Repent! Believe! That is the only remedy, the only way to salvation. If you will not do that, you deserve to be put out of the Church, for you are no longer a member in Christ's body, while you are nourishing and cherishing any sin in your breast. Membership in the Church does you no good. And if the Church knows your sin and impenitence, and yet grants you all the privileges of a member in good standing, that congregation or church

becomes partaker of your sin, and God will require accounting. "Be not partaker of other men's sins." 1 Ti 5, 22; 2 John 11.

TERTULLIAN AS A PHILOSOPHER.

BY REV. J. C. SCHACHT.

Tertullian's place in history is one of great eminence. Among his contemporaries, he unquestionably occupies the highest place. In intellectual ability, in devotion to the cause of Christianity, and in moral purity and fervor, he had few equals among all the Fathers of the Church. His contributions to Christian literature give evidence of extensive learning, and unabating zeal in literary labor. Harnack says that he created Christian Latin literature, that it "sprang from him full-grown, alike in form and substance, as Athene from the head of Zeus." As an apologist he proved himself an intellectual athlete, dealing his antagonists many unexpected and crushing blows;—as a Christian he was rigorous, uncompromising, and puritanical. Moral principle seemed to have completely triumphed in him, his conduct was so completely determined by moral rules as to deprive his life of much of the tenderness of saving grace and Christian geniality. As a theologian he was, in the main, scriptural, with a strong bent toward the law; and as a philosopher, he was often contradictory, but withal original and penetrating. And although much of what he wrote on philosophical subjects is not above criticism, yet it is evident that he was not a tyro at the business. And considering that he was decidedly unfriendly to all philosophy, I can not help wondering that he was so apt at philosophizing. He has given us a number of works which evidently belong to this class of literature. And his "Treatise on the Soul," from which I have collected the few thoughts in the following pages, is by no means the least important of these.

It is very natural to have the desire to know the opinion of a great man on a great subject. We are just now witnessing the spectacle of the world devouring the "Memo-

of Bismarck" warm from the press. And I for one have read with as much eagerness and interest the words of the great Tertullian on the soul, though written nearly seventeen centuries ago.

The question of the nature of the soul upon which a great deal of energy has been wasted by both heathen and Christian philosophers, also engaged the attention of Tertullian. But he wrote on this subject solely in the interest of theology and not to advance the cause of philosophy. The Word of God was his only fountain of knowledge, and he made bold to attack every theory which seemed to him to be inimical to this Christian truth. He even ventured to cross swords with such formidable opponents as Plato, and it is not incorrect to say that very often the victory belongs to Tertullian. Philosophy itself he regarded as the mother of all heresies, and the philosophers as "patriarchs of heretics," though he admits that they occasionally discovered a truth by accident, just as a laboring ship in a storm, when the boundaries of sky and sea are lost in confusion, sometimes stumbles on a harbor. But no man is able to solve the questions of philosophy except he who has had instruction from the Lord, "and that which is learned of God is the sum and substance of the whole thing." His estimate of philosophy, he has vigorously expressed in the following words. He says: "Whatever noxious vapours . . . exhaled from philosophy, obscure the clear and wholesome atmosphere of truth, it will be for Christians to clear away, both by shattering to pieces the arguments which are drawn from the principles of things — I mean those of the philosophers — and by opposing to them the maxims of heavenly wisdom, that is, such as are revealed by the Lord; in order that both the pitfalls wherewith philosophy captivates the heathen may be removed, and the means employed by heresy to shake the faith of Christians may be repressed."

But let us inquire a little more minutely into some of the theories which Tertullian held to be true beyond dispute. It has been said that his view of the soul is almost, if not entirely materialistic; and when we read some of his statements perhaps we can not altogether deny the correctness of his opinion. It is true, in all his writings, especially in his treatise on this subject and also in scattered remarks

throughout his other works, he contends that the soul is corporeal. "The soul," he says, "is endued with a body for if it were not corporeal it could not desert the body. And the fact that he uses as an argument to establish his theory, the interaction of soul and body, which materialist regard to this day as the best evidence of the correctness of their theory, seems to lend additional weight to this charge. He says that things corporeal and things incorporeal have nothing in common as to their susceptibility. "But," he continues, "the soul certainly sympathizes with the body and shares in its pain, whenever it is injured by bruises, and wounds, and sores: the body, too, suffers with the soul and is united with it (whenever it is afflicted with anxiety, distress, or love) in the loss of vigor which its companion sustains, whose shame and fear it testifies by its own blushes and paleness. The soul, therefore, is proved (?) to be corporeal from this intercommunion of susceptibility. It is a foregone conclusion with him that between two entities, unlike in their attributes, interaction is impossible. And since our senses, whose veracity can not be impugned, testify that there is an intercommunion between soul and body, therefore the soul must be of like substance with the body.

Evidently Tertullian realized the difficulty, experienced by human thought, of bridging over from the material to the spiritual. But this difficulty did not worry him alone; it is vexing the philosophers even to this day. And many theories, such as a "pre-established harmony," "occasionalism," and the like, have been proposed to remove it. And I do not hesitate to assert that considered merely as theories, Tertullian's had about as much value as the other inventions. But a little reflection brings out the fact that neither the corporeal soul of Tertullian, nor the solutions of other philosophers, explain the reciprocal influence of the two entities. If it were true that the soul is corporeal, that would by no means simplify the problem. The action of one material thing upon another is just as mysterious as the action of body upon spirit, or of spirit upon body. On this point Hermann Lotze correctly says: "If we observe the motive power of a machine and the way its component parts work on each other, we believe we understand its action."

tion; because our intuition has in this case attained a view of various things about it. On further reflection, however, we discover that we do not understand the two conditions on which the action of all machines depends, — namely, the cohesion of the solid parts and communication of motion." It is evident that Tertullian has made no special contribution to the fund of philosophical knowledge with his theory of a corporeal soul.

But the statement that Tertullian was a materialist after all requires some modification. When we compare his materialism with that of modern times, an important difference will at once appear. Modern materialism denies the existence of a soul as a separate entity altogether; it tries to account for the spiritual life wholly upon the basis of physical activity, some even going so far as to say that "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile." This conclusion is arrived at by materialism from the fact that the spiritual life is profoundly dependent upon the physical organism. Thus what Tertullian regarded as an incontrovertible argument for the materiality of the soul, modern materialism regards as an incontrovertible argument for the non-existence of the soul. But Tertullian never denied the existence of the soul as an entity. The objection to his theory is to be found rather in its gross realism. For example, in connection with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, which he uses as proof of the soul's corporeality, he says: "For unless the soul possessed corporeality, the image of a soul could not possibly contain a finger of a bodily substance, nor would the Scripture feign the statement about the limbs of a body if these had no existence." The soul, he continues, is nothing if it does not consist of a bodily substance; for that which is incorporeal can not be confined and guarded in any way. An incorporeal soul is not capable either of receiving punishment or refreshment; only bodily substances are capable of having such experiences.

Indeed, when one reads these words, it is difficult to escape the impression that Tertullian could not conceive the reality of a thing without defining it in terms of matter. How much of this was due to his lapse into Montanism, I shall not attempt to decide; but it is a significant fact that his theory of the soul's corporeality is especially prominent

in the words he wrote after his adoption of that heresy. It is pretty certain, also, that he would accept nothing inconsistent with "the new prophecy." "Nothing," he says, "ought to be received which does not agree with the true system of prophecy, which has arisen in this present age." From this it seems that Montanism was his rule by which everything else was measured and judged, and that the influence it had upon his thought was greater than some students are willing to allow. And it is worthy of note that he does not always use the same language in speaking of the soul. In his *Apology*, speaking of the restoration of the body, he says, that it too must appear; "for the soul is not capable of suffering without the solid substance; that is, the flesh."

But though his philosophy be faulty, his ability as a defender of the faith will ever be recognized. His writings furnish abundant evidence that he understood every system of philosophy. And he possessed the rare ability of entangling his opponents in endless self-contradictions, thus holding them up to ridicule and contempt.

But, though his philosophy be faulty, his ability as a defender of the faith will ever be recognized. His writings furnish abundant evidence that he understood every system of philosophy. And he possessed the rare ability of entangling his opponents in endless self-contradictions, thus holding them up to ridicule and contempt.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

APRIL, 1899.

No. 2.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

C. *The Jews, indeed, have an Advantage over the Gentiles; but it does not consist in not being Sinners as well as these:* III. 1-20.

From the statement of the apostle in the preceding section that the possession of Law and circumcision can not shield the Jew against the charge of being a sinner and hence in need of the righteousness of God just as well as the gentile, some might draw the inference that then the Jew had no advantage whatever over against the gentile, or, to put it in a different form, that circumcision as the rite of admission to membership in the Old Testament Church of God, was not of any use. Hence, the apostle puts that inference in form of a question in order to refute it (1). In what way soever you may view the difference between a Jew and a gentile, the former has a great advantage. The apostle, however, mentions only the principal point, namely, that the Jews were entrusted with the revelation of God previous to the appearance of Christ — an advantage so manifest that it needs no proof (2). To be sure, in part, and even as to the majority, they did not prove faithful to this trust, not believing nor obeying the Word of God revealed to them; but that certainly cannot invalidate the faithfulness of God who kept His part of the covenant made between Him and the Jewish people and treated them as His people. (3). Here, as in every case, God must be acknowledged to be faithful and true, whilst man always more or less proves to be the contrary; as also the Scriptures state

(Psalm 51, 6), that God will always be found true in His words, and will always come out victorious, when men, so to say, go to law with Him and would charge Him with not having kept His word (4).

But now another objection might be raised: if our unrighteousness, as manifested in our faithlessness over against God, serves to set forth in a clearer light the righteousness of God as appearing in His faithfulness, is not God unjust in punishing us for this our unrighteousness? So only a man can reason when he speaks of God as if He were like one of us (5). For how could God be the Judge of the universe, as every Jew acknowledges Him to be, if He did not judge righteously, in accordance with the moral character of the actions, and not according to their accidental results? (6). For if the faithfulness of God is magnified to His greater glory by my very faithlessness, the only reason that also I, notwithstanding this fact, am condemned for that faithlessness, must be that God is a righteous Judge, moved by no secondary, so to say, selfish, considerations, but merely by the strictest regard for truth and right (7). And that is also the reason that Christians do not do what already in the times of St. Paul they were slanderously charged with, viz., commit what is bad in order that something good may result from it; for a man acting on that principle is justly condemned, since he not simply sins, but even virtually makes the holy and righteous God an abettor of sin, by acting as if He sanctioned such a course (8).

If now, after all these considerations, the question is put, whether the Jews, with whom, for the sake of making his statement less offensive to them, Paul expressly classes himself, have a preference and advantage over against the gentiles, the answer must be, that this is not the case in every respect. However great were the privileges of the Jews as the Old Testament people of God, this certainly was *not* one of them that they were not sinners as well as the gentiles; for in the preceding sections the charge was made and proved by Paul that all men, without any exception, whatever their nationality, descent, and external condition may be, the Jews no less than the gentiles, are under the bondage of sin (9). And this is not a new-fangled notion of Paul's, as the Jews might only be too ready to assume; it is a truth expressed already in many passages of the Old Testament, where it is stated that all men, without any exception, in general are devoid of righteousness and

sinful (10-12; comp. Psalm 14, 1-3; 53, 1-3); that they are, in particular, transgressors of the second table of the Law in word (13, 14; comp. Psalm 5, 10; 140, 4; 10, 7) and deed (15-17; comp. Isa. 59, 7, 8); and this because the fear of God is not what guides and rules them (18; comp. Psalm 36, 2). Now the Jews knew as well as Paul that whatever the Old Testament Scriptures ($\delta\ \nu\delta\mu\upsilon\varsigma$, the Law, used synecdochically; comp. John 10, 34; 12, 34; 15, 25; 1 Cor. 14, 21), say, both in contents ($\lambda\acute{e}\gamma\epsilon\iota$) and form ($\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota$), is also to be applied to those to whom the Old Testament revelation, as the sphere of their activity ($\delta\ \tau\bar{\varphi}\ \nu\delta\mu\omega\varsigma$), was given in the first place, to the Jews. Consequently, that is also the case here, especially since the expression is general, not limited to the gentiles. And thus the Scriptures speak, that no man may dare to justify himself before God, but that every one, also the Jew, may acknowledge himself subject to the punishment of a righteous God (19). For in the judgment of God it is not possible for any natural descendant of Adam ($\sigma\acute{a}\nu\varsigma$, flesh, comp. John 3, 6) to be declared righteous, if the norm be the Law; for since the fall the Law cannot be the means of justification and salvation, no man being able to fulfill it, but it is intended to bring us to a correct knowledge ($\epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$) of our sinful condition and thus lead us to long for a Savior (20; Gal. 3, 24).

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD DESCRIBED (III. 21-VIII. 39).

The Righteousness of God Explained Dogmatically:
III. 21-31.

Now, as things are according to the preceding explanations, the righteousness of God, procured by Him and needed by all men, has been made manifest without the instru-

V. 11. *Understandeth*: has divine wisdom, knows and practices what is conducive to his eternal welfare. *Seeketh after God*: makes Him the object of all his desires and intentions (Heb. XI. 6).—V. 12. *Unprofitable*: doing nothing to the honor of God and the welfare of men (Matt. XXV. 30).—V. 13. *Open sepulchre*: breathing forth corruption and death, causing harm and perdition. *The poison of asps*: they are deceitful and treacherous, not meaning what they say.—V. 16. *Are in their ways*: they cause them wherever they go.—V. 17. *They have not learned to live peaceably with their fellow-men and to do them good.*

mentality of law and works; a righteousness not altogether unknown before the appearance of the Christ, since it has the testimony of the Old Testament (21; comp., as to the matter, 1, 17; 4, 3 sqq.; as to the expression, Matt. 11, 13; John 1, 45), a righteousness, namely, that God alone bestows, through faith in Jesus the Christ, and that exists and is intended for all that believe. Yes, it is intended for all, if they simply accept it by faith; but it is also needed by every one. For in this respect there is no difference between men, whoever they may be: all stand before God as sinners, and therefore are without that glory that only the holy and omniscient God can bestow, and that He must bestow, if man is to be truly and eternally happy, the glory of being righteous in his sight and judgment (22, 23). And whoever is declared righteous by God, is so without any merit or worthiness on his part, by the mere grace of God, by means and in consequence of the redemption that is found in the Messiah Jesus, and that was brought about by the ransom that He paid for our deliverance from sin and all its consequences ($\delta\pi\alpha\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$), namely, His vicarious life, sufferings, and death (24). For He is the one whom God set forth and exhibited as the means of propitiating His holy anger at sin, a means to be appropriated by faith and having its propitiating power in the blood of Christ shed, as the crown and climax of His vicarious work, for the remission of our sins. And this propitiation God Himself procured in order to prove His righteousness notwithstanding His love and mercy. For in passing by during the times of the Old Testament the many sins that were committed and that were not punished because of the forbearance of God, although as yet no atonement had been made for them, He might appear unrighteous, indifferent to sin; but now He has shown forth His righteousness, at the time of Christ, by making Him the propitiation for the sins of the whole human race, from the fall of Adam to the last hour of this earth, so that now God must be recognized as righteous, punishing sin as it deserves, and at the same time

V. 25. *For the remission &c.*: literally, *Because of the passing by* ($\delta\iota\alpha\tau\eta\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\omega$, not $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\tau\eta\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\omega$) *of those sins that had taken place, had been committed, before in the forbearance of God.* The change of the propositions ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma\epsilon\nu\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\omega$ in ver. 25, $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\epsilon\nu\delta$. in ver. 26) does not change the sense; the second simply takes up again the idea expressed by the first (comp. $\epsilon\chi$ and $\delta\iota\alpha$ in ver. 30, $\epsilon\chi$ originally devoting the source, $\delta\iota\alpha$ the means).

can justify every sinner that by faith in Jesus, his Redeemer, has come into a new relation to God (25. 26).

If this, then, is the way, and the only way, to be justified and saved, where can glorying and boasting on the part of man come in? There is no room for it. And this, because not a rule that requires works, but one that requires faith, obtains here, and faith is simply the God-given hand that accepts and appropriates grace (27). For we cannot but draw the conclusion from the foregoing exposition, that the justification of man takes place by faith, without any instrumentality or mediation of works required by a law (28). If this were not the case, God, in the true sense of this term, as a loving, merciful Father, could be the God of the Jews only, since they alone have the Law as the revelation of the holy will of God in its complete, reliable form, which is the necessary condition of adequately fulfilling its requirements. But God is also the God of the gentiles, who do not have the Law in that form, if we are not to suppose that there is another God for these, since God-given reason demands that also they must have a God that made them and cares for them. There is, however, only one God, who will justify all men that permit Him to do so in the same and only possible way: the Jews by no other means than faith, and the heathen by the same means (29. 30). — But does not this doctrine of faith as the only means of justification on the part of man altogether do away with the Law, even in so far as it is the expression of the unchangeable will of God as to the conduct of man? By no means; rather the Law is established, its use and importance is made manifest, and its fulfilment possible, by this very doctrine: in no other way can the Law be of benefit to fallen man than by leading him to repentance and thus to Christ who has fulfilled the Law perfectly for all men and gives to all those who in true faith accept Him as their Savior His Spirit and power so as already here to begin at least to observe the Law and in the world to come to fulfill it perfectly — and that is the doctrine of the Gospel (31).

The Righteousness of God Illustrated Historically:
IV 1-25.

If, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, justification is not by works, but by faith alone, then also Abra-

V. 1. The question of this verse is rhetorical, equivalent to the assertion, Abraham has found or obtained nothing. Flesh = own natural powers. *Κατὰ σάρξα* is best construed with *εὑργέζειαι*; if

ham, the father of the people of the Old Testament covenant, did not by his own powers and works obtain or merit anything before God as to his justification and salvation (1). For, if in a certain sense it can be said that Abraham was justified by his works, it was, indeed, not in his relation to God; and, hence, the cause for glorifying that he may have, can only be such with reference to men to whom he proved himself righteous by his works (2; comp. James 2, 21 sqq.). For the Scriptures clearly ascribe his justification to his faith, which, because of the grace and promise of God that it apprehended, was imputed to him as righteousness, so that he had no righteousness of his own to offer (3). For whenever a person obtains something through his works and merits, hence as his due, we cannot speak of a gracious imputation (4). To him, however, who, without any reliance on his works, places his reliance and confidence in God who justifies a man that in himself is not what he ought to be in relation to Him, but by faith makes his own the merits of Christ, this very faith is imputed for righteousness (5). Of this also David is a witness, who, inspired by the Holy Ghost, pronounces that man happy to whom God imputes righteousness without any reference to works, simply forgiving his transgressions of the Law and covering his sins with the righteousness of Christ (6-8; comp. Ps. 32, 1. 2). And this happiness of justification does not presuppose as a necessary prerequisite the fulfilment of the Law on the part of the person that is to be justified; for Abraham was justified before in and by circumcision he had been placed under the Law and made a beginning of fulfilling it (9 sq.; comp. Gen. 15, 6; 17, 10 sqq.). Circumcision was simply a sign that he received as a divine seal of the justification he already had by faith; and thus, in accordance with the intention of God, he became the father of all believers, both of those that have not been circumcised, and also of those that were circumcised, but also have followed the faith of Abraham before his circumcision (11 sq.). Hence faith is the only

construed with $\tauὸν πρωπάτορα ἡμῶν$, the answer to the question would be, Not justification by works. Others translate the verse in this way: What then shall we say? To have found (= that we have found or obtained) Abraham, as our spiritual forefather, according to the flesh (= by anything external, e. g., circumcision, observance of the Law)? The answer would simply be, No. This, however, seems to us a somewhat unnatural construction and explanation.

divinely-ordained means of receiving the grace of God; for neither Abraham nor his descendants received the promise to inherit Canaan, the type of the kingdom of God and all its blessings, through a law and its works, but simply through a righteousness embraced by, and imputed to, faith (13). Nor can it be otherwise; for if the inheritance had been promised to those that fulfill a law, faith would be without all contents, an empty, hollow thing, as the promise would be void and invalid (14). For the divine Law, which obtains here, since man after the fall can only transgress it, can but bring about the wrath of God and thus hinder the giving of the inheritance; but where a law and its fulfilment is not the condition of receiving the inheritance, there transgression of the Law cannot, of course, excite the wrath of God and thus hinder the fulfilment of the promise and the bestowal of the inheritance (15). The fact, therefore, that justification and salvation is of faith and hence of grace, since faith is nothing but the hand apprehending grace, makes the promise sure to the whole spiritual seed of Abraham, not only to those that were members of the Old Testament people of the Law, but also to those that are his children simply by faith; and thus all Christians, also the former heathen, have him for their father (16), according to the promise (Gen. 17, 5) and the judgment of God in whose faithfulness and power to give him a son he trusted (17), all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding (18), his own age and that of his wife not being able to shake his faith (19). On the contrary, without giving way to any doubt or unbelief as to the fulfilment of the promise, he rather grew in faith, thus giving to God the honor firmly to believe that He will and can do whatever He has prom-

V. 12. *Toīς* before *στοιχοῦσιν* according to grammatical rules should be omitted; it is put for the sake of emphasis, to denote the class that alone is meant.

V. 17. *κατέναντι μὲν ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ* = *κατέναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ψεύτησεν* (a somewhat unusual attraction or assimilation) must be construed with the last clause of the preceding verse: not before men but before God, in His view and judgment, they are Abraham's children. The first clause of v. 17: *καθὼς — σε* is parenthetical. V. 18: "Who believed against hope" (in opposition to any hope that human reason could warrant) "on the basis of hope" (viz., that hope which the promises of God inspired). "To the end that he might become" (according to the intention of God). Comp. Gen. XV. 5.

ised (20 sq.). Hence his faith, because of the promised grace that it apprehended, was imputed to him for righteousness (22). And this was recorded in Holy Writ not only in order that the mode of his justification might be known (23), but also, that we and all Christians might know that we can be justified only by placing our confidence in Him who has raised Jesus from the dead and thus proclaimed Him our Savior (24). For God gave Him over to death in order that He might atone for our transgressions, and raised Him from the dead that we might have a Redeemer indeed, whose atonement has been accepted by God, and thus be justified by faith in Him (25).

The Righteousness of God Insures to us Eternal Salvation.

A. *The Dogmatical Proof: V. 1-11.*

The natural consequence of justification is peace with God who has been reconciled and propitiated through Christ our Savior (1), to whom it is also owing that by faith we have been permitted to enter our present state of grace (*επαγγελίαν*, the Perfect, denoting a past event having lasting effect); and hence we can also rejoice in the hope of the future glory that God possesses and will bestow upon his children eternally (2). But not only in this hope do we rejoice, but also in the afflictions that as Christians we have to bear, since we know that, if we bear them in the right spirit, they will lead to an increase of that hope by making

V. 20. *Ἐις τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*: with regard to the promise.

V. 24. *Μέλλει*: according to the good and gracious will of God.

V. 25. "For our justification": If God had not raised Jesus from the dead we could not be justified; for that would be a proof that Christ had not fully atoned for our sins. A perfect atonement could not but result in a resurrection; and thus the resurrection had to precede our justification.

V. 1. *We have peace* (*εχομεν*): the majority of the old manuscripts and translations read: "Let us have peace (*εχωμεν*)."¹ In connection with the preceding words this, according to the Greek expression, could be translated: "Let us then be justified by faith and in consequence have peace with God." But the reading followed by the Authorized Version fits best in the context which demands that the having of peace be stated as a *fact* resulting from justification. Hence the external testimony here must yield to the internal.

us patient and persevering, tried and approved (3 sq.). And this hope does not put to shame by proving futile and unfounded; of this we are assured by the blessed experience we have in our hearts of the unspeakable love of God for us sinners, an experience vouchsafed to every believer by the Holy Spirit, who works and accompanies faith (5). For what greater love could God have shown us than to let His Son, at the proper time appointed by His wisdom, die for us who did not, and could not, do anything for Him, yea who were His enemies (6). ? For there is scarcely a man, that would die for a righteous person (*δικαιοῦ*), conforming his life to all the requirements of law, whilst for his benefactor (*τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*) perhaps some one might undertake to die (7). Then, most assuredly, the great love of God for us is proved beyond all doubt by His Son's dying for us, when we were not even righteous, much less persons that had done anything for Him and His glory (8). How much more, then, can we be sure of our deliverance from eternal punishment, since now we are justified by means of Christ's vicarious death (9). And if Christ through His humble death reconciled us to God when we were His enemies, how much more can and will He save us eternally, since He is living in divine majesty, and we are reconciled to God (10); yea, not simply are reconciled and hence free from punishment and fear, but can even boast of the true God as our heavenly Father, through Christ to whom we owe our present reconciliation, the earnest of our future perfect salvation (11).

B. *A Historical Illustration: the Parallelism between Adam and Christ: V. 12-21.*

According to what has been set forth in the preceding section, remission of sins, life, and salvation have by one

V. 6. "Ἐτι . . . ἔτι, if the true reading, supported as it is by the best manuscripts, is emphatic: "For Christ *already*, when we were *still* weak." The reading *εἰ γάρ*, conjectured by some ("for if Christ, etc."), would cause an anacoluthon, making necessary the supplement of the apodosis that after the insertion of v. 7 had to be omitted, which apodosis is found in a different form in v. 9 (comp. vv. 12 sqq.; Gal. II. 4 sqq.).

V. 9. 'Ἐν τῷ αἷματι: in Christ's blood, and in it alone, is found the atoning power that is the prerequisite of our justification (Heb. IX. 22; VII. 26 sq.). Ὁρῆς, comp. II. 8.

man, the divinely-appointed head and representative of mankind, Christ Jesus, been obtained for all men; just as through one man, Adam, the natural head and representative of the whole human family, sin and death in all its forms, spiritual, natural, and eternal, entered the world, and were transmitted, from parent to child, to all men, since in Adam, their ancestor and head, all his descendants were contained and represented. As Adam is the *natural* head and representative of the human race, who did what he did as such for his whole posterity and transmitted his condition and nature to all those that by *natural* birth have him for their head: so Christ by divine appointment is the *spiritual* head and representative of mankind, who did what He did as such for all of them and transmits it to all those that by *spiritual* birth through faith have Him for their head (12). That death originally and primarily is the result of the first sin of Adam as the source and representative of the human race, is seen from this that up to the promulgation of the Law through Moses death ruled over all men, even infants, though up to that time among the many sins of men none was found that, like Adam's first sin, was a transgression of a divine command to which the penalty of death had been appended; and God inflicts no punishment that He has not threatened for the transgression of an explicit commandment of His. Hence, that men have to die, is in the first place the result and punishment of the sin that they have committed in and through Adam, their ancestor and representative. And hence, also, the first Adam is the type of the second, of Christ, who likewise is the head and representative of the human race (13 sq.). So there is a likeness between the fall of Adam and the gracious redemption of Christ, in this namely, that both are representative, both

V. 12. The sentence begun here is not completed; but it is taken up again in V. 18 and then completed. Also the last clause of V. 14 indicates what is to be supplied. '*Eφ* ϕ = επὶ τούτῳ δτι: on this (ground) that = because. This is the sense in which Paul always uses this expression (comp. I. Cor. V. 4; Phil. III. 12; IV. 10), and the only one fitting here. *Πάτες γηράπτον*, namely, in and by that sin of Adam. That this is the sense becomes evident from the reasoning in the immediately succeeding verses. In itself the Aorist *γηράπτον* could, of course, refer to the personal sinning of Adam's posterity, as is the case III. 23; for the Aorist does not only express one momentary action of the past, but also "a series or aggregate of acts viewed as constituting a single act" (*Burton*).

have taken place for all men. But there is also a difference between the two: in Christ we have regained more than we lost in Adam. In the first place, we can be sure that the grace of God, who sent Christ, and the gracious gift of Christ, the second Adam, who lived, suffered, and died for mankind, will more than balance that one unhappy act of the first Adam, saving the many that by Adam's sin have become subject to death (15). In the second place, the gracious gift of Christ is not of such a nature as if it had been occasioned only by that first sin of Adam and were to atone merely for that. Christ did not atone for that one sin only, but for all the sins of men that have followed it, so that through Christ's atonement we have the remission of all our sins, original and actual, justification instead of condemnation (16). And this is the case because the abounding grace of God and the abounding gift of righteousness obtained by Christ are far greater than the sin of Adam: they have an *intensive* and therefore also an *extensive* superiority over the latter. Hence life will most assuredly reign where formerly death reigned, if only Christ and His merits are accepted by faith (17). Thus, then, as the consequence of Adam's fall was the condemnation to death for all men, so the consequence of the righteousness acquired by Christ is justification unto life for all men (18). For as Adam's transgression of God's commandment made all

V. 14. *Kai ἐπὶ τλ.*: "also over them," &c., not only over Adam. *Μή*, the subjective negation, implies that we are apt to suppose the contrary.

V. 15. 'Εν γάρ τι belongs closely to δωρεά, characterizing it as a gift that has its only foundation and source "in grace." Thus the grace of God and the grace of the man Jesus Christ are put side by side as the efficient cause of our redemption; and that such a grace can be predicated of Jesus Christ makes His gift, his vicarious life, sufferings, and death, so effective, as the gift of the God-man.

V. 16. Τὸ δώρημα, scil. ἐγένετο, or ἐστίν; ἐξ ἐνάς, namely, Adam; ἐξ πολλῶν πάραπτωμάτων, either, from many trespasses, or from trespasses of many (πολλῶν masculine and dependent on παραπτωμάτων); εἰς ζατάριμα . . . εἰς δικαιώμα, scil. ἐγένετο: came.

V. 18. 'Ενας in both cases must, in accordance with the preceding verses, be regarded as masculine, not neuter, referring in the first place to Adam, in the second to Christ: "Through transgression of one . . . through act of righteousness of one." Εἰς ζατάριμα . . . εἰς δικαιώσιν scil. ἀπέβη, has turned out unto condemnation and justification. Εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους in both cases to be understood objectively: for all men there is condemnation and justi-

men sinners, so also Christ's fulfillment of the Law acquired righteousness for all men, so that, if by faith they accept Christ as their head and Savior, they will be justified (19). And this is not changed by the Law that came in between Adam's fall and Christ's redemption; for it was introduced not as a means of justification and salvation, but to give an opportunity and occasion to sin that is in man to manifest itself the more by transgressing the Law, so that sin could be known the better and thus cause man to look for a savior; and where sin thus has become abundant, divine grace in Christ has shown itself still more abundant, conquering and covering all this sin (20), in order that just as sin exerted and manifested its dominion and power in death, bringing it upon all sinners, so divine grace might exert and manifest its dominion and power through Jesus, the Christ and Savior of men, by the righteousness obtained by Him that opens the door to eternal life, everlasting communion with God, the source of all happiness and blessedness, to every man that in true faith accepts it as his own (21).

fication; the former in Adam and his transgression, the latter in Christ and his fulfillment of the Law. The subjective and final condition and lot of every man depends upon his relation to Christ: if he does not by faith recognize Christ as his representative and substitute, his relation to Adam, by natural descent, determines his eternal fate, brings upon him everlasting damnation as the ultimate result of the inevitable reaction of a holy and just God against sin; if by faith he appropriates what Christ has procured for all men, God imparts it to him personally and individually, regards and treats him as holy and righteous. By raising Christ from death God publicly declared His atonement for all the sins of the human race complete and perfect; in other words, He justified Christ, pronounced Him free from all the sins that as the representative and substitute of all men He had taken upon Himself. But the justification of man's representative and substitute is necessarily man's own justification, provided he recognizes and embraces the representative and substitute as his own. The justification of all men in Christ may be called objective, or universal, or potential; it becomes subjective and personal, or actual, by faith only. That there is a difference between the universal justification in Christ and the personal by faith is manifest from the next verse where the Future tense (*χαστάθησονται*) is used of the latter over against the Aorist (*χαστάθησαν*) describing the result of Adam's disobedience which in itself made every man a sinner personally and individually because of his natural connection with Adam.

FINAL REVISION OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM.

ADOPTED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL BODIES.

INTRODUCTORY.

In the year 1888 the president of our Synod, the Rev. Dr. M. Loy, received a communication from Dr. H. E. Jacobs, the Secretary of the Joint Committee on Liturgies, composed of members representing the United Synod of the South, the General Council and the General Synod, in which our Synod was invited to participate in arranging a uniform text of Luther's small catechism and the Augsburg Confession. This letter was submitted to Synod and the committee to which it was submitted recommended to Synod that we accept the invitation and appoint a committee to work with the others. See Eng. Min. of 1888, pp. 14 and 18. Synod expressly reserved the right to sit in judgment on the desired uniform translation before it could be considered the text to be used. See Eng. Min. 1888, p. 19, Ad 9.

The committee of our Synod has been represented at every meeting of the general committees. In all, four meetings were held; two in Philadelphia, Pa., and two in Wernersville, Pa. The effort has been made to present a translation of the catechism that would be faithful to the text and spirit of the original, and at the same time do justice to the idiom of the language into which it is rendered. The reports of the committee in the minutes of 1892, p. 103, and of 1894 p. 138 and 139 show that a final effort was made. As our committee was not fully satisfied, it proved the case with members of other synods, and the committee was called together again on Sept. 13, 1898, in Wernersville, Pa., and the whole catechism, with the exception of the Preface, was gone over with the greatest care. All the objections and suggestions before the committee received due consideration. It appears to me that almost every suggestion that could be advised, on all points where one might desire the text to be different, was before us. They were voted on in turn, and that one remained which in the judgment of the committee was the best. Take any point that may not appear to suit you. Let us illustrate by the

shibboleth of the ten commandments. The text runs: "we should fear and love God, and"; this was decided in the third meeting after every effort had been made to retain the one in present use among us, and no less than ten other forms had been suggested, tried and found wanting. In the late meeting an effort was made to replace the one adopted by another; but after adopting another and feeling relieved that we had gotten over a great mountain, we were glad to return to the one as it stands now.

The same can be said with most other changes. The work was carefully done, and every thing weighed as it deserved. The position and action of our Synod will have due weight in the ultimate acceptance or rejection of the labors of this committee. As a member of the committee I never got a written suggestion on the translation from a member of Synod. Therefore on the final action I could be guided only by the advice of Dr. Loy given to me beforehand, and by my own judgment. I therefore joined in the action of the committee: Resolved, That we adopt this revision as in the judgment of the committee the best that can be made, and that it be printed and reported to the General Bodies.

It is hoped that our brethren will be pleased with the final work and that Synod will act in the matter and assist in giving force to the efforts of the committee.

E. G. TRESSEL.

I. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

In the plain form in which the head of the family should teach them to his household.

I AM THE LORD THY GOD.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

Ques. What is meant by this?

Ans. We should fear, love and trust in God above all things.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not curse, swear, conjure, lie or deceive by his name, but call upon his name in every time of need, and worship him with prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.

Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not despise preaching and his word, but deem it holy and gladly hear and learn it.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Honor thy father and thy mother, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not despise our parents and superiors, nor provoke them to anger, but honor, serve, obey, love and esteem them.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not kill.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not hurt nor harm our neighbor in his body, but help and befriend him in every bodily need.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and live chaste and pure in words and deeds, and husband and wife each love and honor the other.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not steal.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not take our neighbor's money or property, nor get it by false wares or false dealing, but help him to improve and protect his property and living.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not falsely belie, betray, backbite nor slander our neighbor, but excuse him, speak well of him, and put the best construction on all he does.

THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not craftily seek to gain our neighbor's inheritance or home, nor get it by a show of right, but help and serve him in keeping it.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his cattle, nor anything that is his.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We should fear and love God, and not estrange, force or entice away from our neighbor, his wife, servants or cattle, but urge them to stay and do their duty.

Q. What does God say of all these commandments?

A. He says: I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. God threatens to punish all who transgress these commandments, therefore we should fear his wrath, and do nothing against such commandments. But he promises grace and every blessing to all who keep these commandments; therefore, we should love and trust in him, and gladly do according to his commandments.

II. THE CREED.

In the plain form in which the head of the family should teach it to his househould.

THE FIRST ARTICLE.

Of Creation.

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. I believe that God has made me, together with all creatures; that he has given and still preserves to me my body and soul, eyes, ears, and all my members, my reason and all my senses; also clothing and shoes, meat and drink, house and home, wife and child, land, cattle and all my goods; that he richly and daily provides me with all that I need for this body and life, protects me against all danger, and guards and keeps me from all evil; and all this, purely out of fatherly, divine goodness and mercy, without any merit or worthiness in me; for all which I am in duty bound to thank and praise, to serve and obey him. This is most certainly true.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

Of Redemption.

And in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord; who has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with his holy, precious blood, and with his innocent sufferings and death; in order that I might be his own, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness, even as he is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

Of Sanctification.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints; the forgiveness of sins; the Resurrection of the body; and the Life everlasting. Amen.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him; but the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith; even as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith; in which Christian Church he daily and richly forgives me and all believers all our sins, and at the last day will raise up me and all the dead, and will grant me and all believers in Christ everlasting life. This is most certainly true.

III. THE LORD'S PRAYER.

In the plain form in which the head of the family should teach it to his household.

Our Father who art in heaven.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. God would hereby tenderly invite us to believe that he is truly our Father, and we are truly his children, so that we may ask of him with all cheerfulness and confidence, as dear children ask of their dear father.

THE FIRST PETITION.

Hallowed be Thy name.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. The name of God is indeed holy in itself; but we pray in this petition that it may be hallowed also among us.

Q. How is this done?

A. When the word of God is taught in its truth and purity, and we as the children of God, lead holy lives, in accordance with it; this grant us, dear Father in heaven! But he that teaches and lives otherwise than the word of God teaches, profanes the name of God among us; from this preserve us, Heavenly Father!

THE SECOND PETITION.

Thy kingdom come.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. The kingdom of God comes indeed of itself, without our prayer, but we pray in this petition that it may come also to us.

Q. How is this done?

A. When our Heavenly Father gives us his Holy Spirit, so that by his grace we believe his holy word, and live godly here in time, and in heaven forever.

THE THIRD PETITION.

Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. The good and gracious will of God is done indeed without our prayer; but we pray in this petition that it may be done also among us.

Q. How is this done?

A. When God defeats and hinders every evil counsel and purpose, which would not let us hallow God's name nor let his kingdom come, such as the will of the devil, the world, and our own flesh; but strengthens and keeps us steadfast in his word and in faith unto our end. This is his gracious and good will.

THE FOURTH PETITION.

Give us this day our daily bread.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. God gives daily bread indeed without our prayer even to all the wicked; but we pray in this petition that he would lead us to acknowledge and receive our daily bread with thanksgiving.

Q. What is meant by "daily bread?"

A. All that belongs to the wants and support of the body, such as meat, drink, clothing, shoes, house, home, land, cattle, money, goods, a pious spouse, pious children, pious servants, pious and faithful rulers, good government, good weather, peace, health, order, honor, good friends, trusty neighbors and the like.

THE FIFTH PETITION.

And forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We pray in this petition that our Father in heaven would not look upon our sins, nor, on account of them, deny our prayer; for we are not worthy of anything we ask, neither have we deserved it; but that he would grant us all through grace; for we sin much every day, and deserve nothing but punishment. And we on our part will heartily forgive and readily do good to those who sin against us.

THE SIXTH PETITION.

And lead us not into temptation.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. God indeed tempts no one, but we pray in this petition that God would guard and keep us, that the devil, the world and our flesh may not deceive us, nor lead us into disbelief, despair and other shameful sin and vice; and, though we be thus tempted, that we may still in the end overcome, and hold the victory.

THE SEVENTH PETITION.

But deliver us from evil.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. We pray in this petition, as the sum of all, that our Father in heaven would deliver us from all manner of evil — in body and soul, property and honor — and at last, when the hour of death shall come, grant us a blessed end, and graciously take us from this vale of sorrow to himself in heaven.

[For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever.]

AMEN.

Q. What is meant by this?

A. That I should be sure that these petitions are acceptable to our Father in heaven, and are heard by him; for he himself has commanded us so to pray, and has promised to hear us. Amen, Amen, that is, Yea, Yea; it shall be so.

IV. THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY BAPTISM.

In the plain form in which the head of the family should teach it to his household.

I.

Q. What is Baptism?

A. Baptism is not simply water, but it is the water comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's word.

Q. What is that word of God?

A. That which Christ our Lord spake in the last chapter of Matthew: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

II.

Q. What benefits does Baptism confer?

A. It works forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe what the words and promises of God declare.

Q. Which are those words and promises of God?

A. Those which Christ our Lord spake in the last chapter of Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."

III.

Q. How can water do such great things?

A. It is not water indeed that does it, but the word of God, which is in and with the water, and faith which trusts this word of God in the water. For without the word of God, the water is simply water, and no baptism. But with the word of God, it is a baptism, that is, a gracious water of life and a washing of regeneration in the Holy Ghost; as St. Paul says, Titus iii, 5-8: "According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. This is a faithful saying."

IV.

Q. What does such baptizing with water signify?

A. It signifies that the old Adam in us should, by daily sorrow and repentance, be drowned and die, with all sins and evil lusts; and again a new man daily come forth and arise, who shall live before God in righteousness and purity forever.

Q. Where is this written?

A. St. Paul says, Rom. 6, 4: "We are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as he was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

HOW PEOPLE SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO CONFESS.

Q. What is Confession?

A. Confession embraces two parts; one, that we confess our sins; the other, that we receive absolution or forgiveness from the pastor as from God himself and in no wise doubt, but firmly believe that through it our sins are forgiven before God in heaven.

Q. What sins should we confess?

A. Before God we should acknowledge ourselves guilty of all sins, even of those which we do not discern; as we do in the Lord's Prayer. But before the pastor we should confess those sins only which we know and feel in our hearts.

Q. Which are these?

A. Here consider your station in the light of the Ten Commandments, whether you be a father, mother, son, daughter, master, mistress, servant; whether in these relations you have been disobedient, unfaithful, slothful; whether you have wronged any one by word or deed; whether you have stolen, neglected, wasted aught, done any harm.

V. THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR.

In the plain form in which the head of the family should teach it to his household.

Q. What is the Sacrament of the Altar?

A. It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, instituted by Christ himself for us Christians to eat and to drink.

Q. Where is this written?

A. The holy Evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, together with St. Paul, write thus:

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is My Body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me.

“After the same manner, also, when He had supped, He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; this cup is the New Testa-

ment in My Blood, which is shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins; this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me."

Q. Of what use is such eating and drinking?

A. It is shown us by these words: "Given and shed for you, for the remission of sins"; namely, that in the sacrament forgiveness of sins, life and salvation are given us through these words. For where there is forgiveness of sins, there is also life and salvation.

Q. How can bodily eating and drinking do such great things?

A. It is not the eating and drinking, indeed, that does it, but the words which stand here: "Given, and shed for you, for the remission of sins." These words, together with the bodily eating and drinking, are the chief thing in the Sacrament; and he that believes these words, has what they say and mean, namely, the forgiveness of sins.

Q. Who then receives this sacrament worthily?

A. Fasting and bodily preparation are indeed a good outward discipline; but he is truly worthy and well prepared, who has faith in these words: "Given and shed for you, for the remission of sins." But he who believes not these words, or doubts, is unworthy and unprepared; for the words, *FOR YOU*, require truly believing hearts.

THE LEAGUE STATUS IN THE CHURCH.*

BY REV. E. CRONENWETT, A. M., BUTLER, PA.

II.

A. The League an interdenominational Federation at large—from a General Council view-point.

1. A judicial Opinion.

The League Review of July 1895 reports the proceedings of the Pennsylvania State League in convention at

* In the article "The League Status in the Church" of the February number of the *Columbus Theological Magazine* there were three tyographical errors, viz.: Page 45, five lines from below, instead of "Christian" read "distinctively Calvinistic features." Page 48, nine lines from below, instead of "intricate" read "intrinsic soul-basis." Page 52, second line from above, instead of "inseparable" read "insuperable denominational barriers."

Reading on June 25 of that year. From this we learn that the Hon. Judge G. A. E. delivered the address of welcome, in which he said: "I observe from the constitution that the League is of that comprehensive kind that ignores the differences that exist between different synods of the Church. * * * There was nothing accidental about the League. It was the natural growth of the Church, and its success was due to the fact that the Church was ready for it." Accordingly, this inter-synodical federation grew spontaneously from congenial soil — and by its fruit we may know the tree. However, the Honorable Judge remarks: "There are those in the Lutheran Church, as well as in all others, who delight to find fault with every step towards advancement which the Church takes, simply to have something with which to contend. But, generally, the Church is well pleased when all differences can be overcome, and the Church moves on as one body."

This is naive. In this wise, objectors are as readily disposed of as "the differences," by serenely ignoring them — "and the Church moves on as one body." But the differences are thereby neither resolved, nor are objections answered. Those who object, because of the differences, are glibly assumed to "find fault" — "simply to have something with which to contend." A lucid judicial comprehension of the situation, truly. St. Jude, of contrary mind, says: "It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Jude 3. His Honor, judging from the reported address of welcome, sees the step-towards the Church's advancement lying in the opposite direction. It is here that we differ. And this our ground of objection will not let itself be thus summarily brushed aside.

2. The Argument of Organization and Spontaneity.

Next in order, on above occasion, and introductory to the address of the day on "Young People's Societies, their Use and their Abuse," the speaker, Rev. F. F. F., dwelt at some length on the League at large, and on this subject, in part, said: "We are living in an age of organizations and conventions. Not only in our own State and nation, but throughout the civilized world, individuals are banding together for a common cause with a common aim. * * * And among the most successful and progressive organizations of this character I place in the vanguard the Luther League. * * * What a marvelous record it can show!"

It has sprung into existence as if by magic. * * * It has advanced almost like a tidal wave. * * * If you ask me for my proof or illustration of its success, my answer is, Look around you. * * * Some may still shake their heads in doubt and question the wisdom of this movement. But its wisdom has been already abundantly justified. Its wondrous growth proves its genuine need."

3. Is the point conclusive?

Does phenomenal spread in a movement evidence its wisdom, justify it — prove its genuine need? Let a few tests answer. In Genesis, Chapter 2, we read: "And they said one to another, Go to, let us make bricks, and burn them thoroughly. * * * And let us build us a city, and tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." And they all fell to. Here was a popular movement, spontaneity and spread, mass-organization and action, all in a trice. What does it prove? The Crusaders (11th and 13th centuries) convulsed Europe, carried off the flower of its chivalry to the Orient and so fevered the masses that 30,000 French children with two successive bands of German boys and girls of 20,000 each thronged forth to wrest the holy city, as if by a miracle, from Moslem hands — to miserably perish or be yet more miserably enslaved. That tidal wave bore yeoman, knight and child before it, leaving wretchedness, bleaching bones and nameless graves in its wake. It had sentiment for it — did it have God's sanction? Within the memory of our sires "New measureism" rushed resistlessly through the land, sweeping doctrinal instruction out of the churches and the anxious bench system in, leaving barrenness in its pathway — was it the wisdom of God? Dio Lewis' Women's Crusade craze, within our own recollection, storming saloons with prayer from the curbstone, started as from spontaneous combustion and leaped like wildfire from place to place — did that establish its soundness?

The Reverend speaker, instancing the might of concentrated force, said: "Take the social world with its different orders, associations and fraternities. How thoroughly organized they are! How they rally in mighty conventions! Their compact organization is largely the source of their power." — Yes, if any movements have the characteristics of spontaneity and spread, these orders have — does it prove their need? A year or two ago, a national rally of Young People's Societies from all parts of the Union met

in overflowing convention in San Francisco, at cost in traveling expenses and hotel fares of thousands upon thousands of dollars. They fluttered their ribbons, saw the sights and had a good time, but what was thereby accomplished "For Christ and the Church"? "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." 1 Kings 20, 11. There have been blossoms of promise that ripened into apples of Sodom. In the light of past experience, and knowing that the harvest is characterized by the sowing, "Some may still snake their heads in doubt" and question the policy and polity of this movement. Its "wisdom" has not "been already abundantly justified," nor does "its wondrous growth" prove "its genuine need." The establishment of this point requires other evidence.

4. What it is—and what it is not.

We are told by the speaker: "Not only have we organized into congregations and conferences and synods, but what is more pertinent to the subject, into young people's societies. And among the most successful and progressive organizations of this character I place in the vanguard the Luther League. * * * It is essentially and distinctively a Lutheran organization, composed of Lutheran young people. It is not a legislative body, but is devoted to the interest and welfare of the Church of the Reformation. It works in the Church, for the Church, with the Church. It consists of a band of Christians leagued together to rally for the right. It stands firmly and unequivocally on the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. * * * Though young in years, it has come to stay. What it lacks in experience is more than counterbalanced by its fervent zeal and glowing enthusiasm. It is full of bounding life and activity." This may be rhetoric, rhetoric however is neither theology nor logic.

This federation, accordingly, is not the Church visible, tangible and responsible, as autonomously organized into congregations, conferences, synods — but "a band of Christians leagued together," "composed of Lutheran young people" — that from within the Church extends beyond congregation, conference, synod, and draws into its trans-synodical influence from every side the youth of the fold. "It works in the Church, for the Church, with the Church" — but as self-constituted factor over the which as organization and its work the Church has not the supervision. It roots in the congregation, but is not as body at large amenable to it. It stands in an abnormal independentistic relation of emancipation from the Church to the Church — inside,

alongside, outside and beyond the Church. Though of the Church, to whom it owes existence and prestige and whose ground it occupies, it ignores the Church's distinctive convictions, as held by the home congregation and synod, knows no forum in the Church whose findings it should respect and acknowledges accountability for whatever it may choose to do or not to do — to none. "What it lacks in experience is more than counterbalanced by its fervent zeal and enthusiasm. It is full of bounding life and activity." Then, no matter what warped tendencies, through zeal without knowledge, in keeping with the spirit of its abnormal relation and polity, it may as Church within the Church entertain and develop — it is logically beyond the Church's control, and we are significantly told — "It has come to stay!" — Let pastors, churches, synods, who may fancy that they can at any time put a firm hand on the lever of such movement, once grown to might as extended popular organization, beware — lest they heedlessly have called into being a "Frankenstein" to their sorrow.

5. Not "legislative," but trend-directing.

"It is not a legislative body, but is devoted to the interest and welfare of the Church of the Reformation." And, pray, who is the better judge of what is to the Church's highest interests and true well-being, youth—or their sires? The Preacher said: "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child." Eccles. 10, 16. "Is counsel perished from the prudent? is their wisdom vanished?" Jer. 49, 7. "The interest and welfare of the Church of the Reformation" — the Church distinctively of the Word — is not best conserved by a policy that brings to the front the counsel of the junior laity in the councils of the Lord to the disparagement of the deeper penetration of those of riper judgment. The serious work and contention of the Church militant "against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Ephes. 6, 12), calls for other and sterner discipline. "Not a legislative body"! — Said one who knew: "Let me write a nation's songs, and I care not who makes its laws." "Not a legislative body" — but one that ignores the "legislation" of the Church and fosters a spirit that throws conservative confessional distinctiveness to the winds.

6. Confessional subscription — what it involves.

“It stands firmly and unequivocally on the Unaltered Augsburg Confession.” — Yet it ignores the very spirit of that Confession, which witnesses distinctively as between truth and error and has regard for Christ’s faithful witnesses to the truth and endorses their testimony. Moreover, in particular, Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession, to which unequivocal subscription is claimed to be made, “Concerning Ecclesiastical Order — or Church Government,” pertinently declares: “No man shall in the Church publicly teach * * * except he be rightly called [without a regular call].” All Lutherans know that the “rightly called” constitute the Church’s public ministry and are officially vested with the functions of Church-government—“to take care of the Church of God.” 1 Tim. 3, 5. “Take heed * * * to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers.” Acts 20, 28. Consistent subscription to the Augsburg Confession hence requires intelligent submission to the Lord’s order in His Church: “Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves.” Heb. 13, 17. The Lord Himself provided for the care and furtherance of the interests and well-being of His Church in His own wise way. “He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.” Eph. 4, 11. 12. These His appointments He intends shall be respected in the business of His kingdom. “Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers?” 1 Cor. 12, 29. “No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God.” Heb. 5, 4. And the Lord stipulates certain qualifications necessary for His specially commissioned spokesmen: “The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who are able to teach others also.” 2 Tim. 2, 2. “Apt to teach * * * not a novice.” 1 Tim. 3, 2. 6. “Be not many masters.” James 3, 1. Indiscriminate public teaching, reforming — shaping the trend of affairs in the Church, is, accordingly, not in keeping with faithful subscription to the Confession or with Scriptures.

Whence then — and be it seriously considered — whence the authority that exempts a doctrinal training school in the Church at large, under the form of an inter-synodical churchly federation of the junior laity, from the supervision of Church government? Whence the “regular

call" that places such irresponsible body into position in the Church to give cast to the confessional trend of its rising membership? What of unequivocal subscription to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, of devotion to the interests and welfare of the Church of the Reformation, of fervent zeal and enthusiasm, of bounding life and activity, of working in, for, and with the Church, of staying qualities and wisdom that has been abundantly justified — of an abnormal factor in the Church, which from point of departure to final issue—as rooted, knitted, surreptitious might—can logically have but one significance for the Church — domination by absorption, or disruption.

B. Sequence of aggressive Obtrusion of the Abnormal on the Church.

1. General Principles.

Prophesying without a call, and surreptitious position and power in the Church is the abnormal. A wrong relation anywhere subverts the right relation. And as a line, departing at a tangent from the direct course between two points, gets farther apart the further it proceeds—so aberrance from that which is right will increase in proportion to its persistence. Such a cause in the Church, bent on having its will, can only resist lawful restraint wrongfully, and with illegitimate means. Furthermore, the spirit of aggressive aberration, whilst it antagonizes the rightfully normal, brooks "no antagonism." Again, the more the radically abnormal has intrenched itself, the more difficult its dislodgment, the more serious the resultant agitation to the Church—the greater the inevitable schism of invariable adherents to error. It behooves us therefore to be foresighted — the more so, since insipient departure from the normal, at the first, seems so trivial—so very trivial, that they who take note of it and give warning are usually derided for their pains. Yet are they justified in the end. There are correct principles governing Church polity and Church extension as well as morals and faith. Violation of these must work disaster.

2. Special danger from Combines.

In the private cure of souls dealing is with individuals aside from the multitude. And in disciplinary cases, ordinarily, there is consciousness in advance in the lapsed of isolation, of being detached from others by defection; hence, more or less defined, a feeling of standing or falling alone.

Such conviction of self-incurred ostracism favors approach. Far otherwise is it in case of leagued wrong doing—especially so when the error is not in subjective intention but in the character and attitude of the combine. Those in federation stand not alone, there are others and possibly a respectable company who stand by them. Though approached as individuals—there is a counter influence of members at their back. In their turning from identification with associated defection, there is practically testimony borne, reflection cast on those holding out in the wrong—hence untowardness to face, perhaps odium to brave. Issue in such case is not with an isolated conscience, but with one abetted in the wrong—virtually with the fiat of organized might in its power over the soul. With such, and especially with those who are imperiously in the lead, honor is not seen in manly surrender—but in arrogant defiance.

3. The spirit of the day.

The spirit of emancipation from wholesome restraint, and lack of piety for that which is holy—is in the air. License in the guise of liberty grows brazen. “By the grace of God, King”—has become the butt of gibes. Rome's prelates alone yet signally command reverence—and that from venal considerations of policy on the part of the Protestant, business and political world. The elders that rule well, especially they who labor in the Word and doctrine, instead of being counted worthy of double honor, are in a fair way of being retired. People are getting tired of being tutored by preachers and will not stand it any more, we are told. Precocity is quick-fledged and chafes at irksome trammels. This may be seen in illustrations from the life. *Exempla docent.*

4. How it works.

You are a pastor, and presumably prudent. There is no young folk's society in your congregation, but you have in your flourishing church a live Sunday-school, probably two if your fold be German and English, and all your young people, grown and small, within reach are in its departments. Some of its older members conclude there is room for a Young Folk's Society—else probably the Y. M. C. A., the Epworth League or Christian Endeavorers may switch the young Lutherans in. They tell you so, and at the same time state that a few of them are at work on a constitution, in fact, have it about finished, saying: “We think, it will be a good thing—don't you?” You reply, “That depends

on what you propose!" And you see that they are nettled. Now an old-time elder would say: "Why, the pastor should outline that!" But we are living in an age of Kindergarten-prayer-and experience-meeting-departments in the churches. The junior laity want to try their hand on their own hook in public church matters. That's the milk in the cocoanut. They might efficiently and honorably work on the pastor's staff as his aids, but that were in a measure in a subordinate position and under supervision, as at Sunday-school and not up to the times. That would not be a modern young folk's league.

On some evening some six or eight young men of the congregation from the age of 21 to 35, several of them perhaps married, come to your study with their work. It is an elaborate document, built on the framework of a college literary society with by-laws in detail. Some of the committee may have been at college. The plan provides for the customary officers, critics, editor, weekly Bulletin—with question-box department to be answered by the pastor; essays, declamations, debates; stated lectures by the pastor, or at his option waiving it, by some other minister of Synod. The pastor is recognized, *ex officio*, as honorary member. At this point you will call special attention to the supervisory character of the pastor's office over all departments in the congregation, whereupon the words are inserted "and advisory"; besides, there is an emergency stipulation requiring the pastor's advice to be sought. His occasional presence in the Society is requested. The superscription over the whole, giving it imposing front reads thus: The object of this Society shall be: "The promotion among its members, by mutual co-operation, of literary culture, temperance reform, social purity, and all Christian graces, and especially of a more extended knowledge in and of a closer attachment and devotion to the work, history and doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church."

Such is not quite your ideal of a churchly training school for the young people, or junior working department in the congregation. Your suggestion of courses of historical, doctrinal, practical studies and work under the pastor, is considered to be too far in advance of the young folks—not catching. "They must first be educated up to it"—and that is promised to come "after a while". This is what now is wanted. And thinking that young people must not always be too seriously taken, you acquiesce in the project

"as a literary society in the Church, that takes into its scope the discussion of churchly topics"; but, you explicitly condition, "the discussion of doctrinal matters on the floor of the society must take place in the presence of the pastor, even as the doctrinal discussions in District Synods also take place in the presence of the President of Joint Synod." The young people are rallied, and you drop in at the close of the session, to find a state of general chafing unto the verge of bad temper, under the lash of the impetuous managers, who insist on immediate adoption and subscription of Constitution and by-laws. You are recognized by the chair and remark, mollifyingly, that nothing will be lost by further discussion of the objects and principles involved—and tension is relieved. On your going out after adjournment, you are excitedly assailed by one of the "charter members"—that had you not put your foot into it and interfered—the constitution would have been adopted. You learn that your future presence at this stage is—on the part of the managers—"not expected". However, you are expected at a distance to be serviceable, and requested from the pulpit to co-operate and fill up the ranks of membership. If you do not, umbrage will be taken. You accordingly publish the organization of the "Literary society" in the congregation and cordially invite attendance at its meetings. The young people heed their pastor and hear the following:

Society Bulletin. Vol. 1. No. 1.: "This is most emphatically not a literary society. The literary feature is but the channel chosen to carry out a noble work; but it is not the object, nor is it the end—it is the means. If you entertain that fallacious opinion dispossess it at once, and if outsiders hold it disabuse their minds promptly. Never permit it to be called a literary society in your hearing. We have a higher, a better, a nobler purpose. Recognizing our responsibility to God and Church and brother, we have united to do the best our circumstances will allow. Don't let anybody think we intend to do the work for which the Church was divinely appointed! Not much! We have too much common sense to begin a tower of Babel which must end in confusion."

You will profit by the correction. And you have learned something. There is here the freedom of the press, and it will be used according to the inclination and judgment of the editor. The Bulletin is in position to reply to

the pulpit, and to scathingly score real or fancied sins or foibles of the congregation as well as take note of current events in general—or in facetious way: there is thus censorship—self-constituted—exercised ad libitum over pastor and fold:

Society Bulletin: “In ‘Unum’s’ paper in the current number a startling fact is stated in that ‘When Holy Writ runs contrary to one’s wishes or is opposed to popular practice’ it is ‘suppressed or interpreted of doubtful meaning.’ In nothing is this plainer exemplified than in the popular drinking practices of this congregation. * * * What does God’s Word amount to in comparison with whisky and beer? How many Lutherans have decided in favor of drink? No, that is not the question. How many have not? To hide the inconsistency of Christian profession and the use of intoxicating beverages when the latter give so much offence in this country the Scriptures are perverted and certain texts stretched like gum elastic. Out with such hypocrisy.” — Such unfounded, wholesale onslaught on your congregations is outrageous.

Society Bulletin: Madam N. N.’s “lecture in the Presbyterian Church a few weeks ago is everywhere spoken of as simply grand. It is only another illustration of the mental quality or superiority of the ‘weaker sex.’ — By the way, that woman spoke from a pulpit, and actually up to this writing, the pulpit has not yet gone to pieces!” (1 Cor. 14, 34; 1 Tim. 2, 12.)

Here is now an organization within the Church autonomously moving forward in its own grooves that must be reckoned with in its corporate capacity. As members and officials of that body the parishioners in it stand in an abnormal relation to the pastor. Under their constitution and laws they feel that they have fancied rights and license of movement with which the pastor must not interfere. Though he is advisory member, his advice and caution is irksome just where required. They who would lead, have need to be led. Will he try to counteract by anonymous contributions to the Bulletin, dealing with general principles — his positions are perverted in reply. The spirit of inflation is not open to instruction. The membership at large is in the hands of the managers. These stand between the pastor and his younger flock, and interpose diplomatically by means of parliamentary tactics. Masterful minds are not slow in knowing their opportunity. Through shrewd praise, some of the youth come to think

well of themselves and their trainers — and fond parents are won over. Position of dominance in the Church lures, and there is strong temptation to reach out further and in bad faith to climb higher.

You have seen in family government a disposition to elbow authority aside — and you see here a similar trend. You know somewhat too the mettle of the parties before you, and you do not court an issue. But you are well aware that it pivots on certain conditions — and you seek tactfully to divert lines drawing closer together and threatening to impinge. Hence you improve frequent opportunity to clear up underlying principles to the leaders in this movement, and, as invisibly at the helm, to guide aright. Perhaps you are too deferential. They knowingly understand and seemingly acquiesce — but practically manifest no disposition to yield in aught the vantage ground gained. The reins are slipping from your hands and others are acquiring control of the situation. With you it is the Lord's cause, with them a matter of prestige. Meanwhile according to request you embarrass not the younger folk by your presence during their performing — and thus by the way are kept out — and as desired attend only during recess and the reading of the Bulletin, for which you furnish your quota of literary material. Under such arrangement it happens one evening during recess that you are approached by one with the suggestion: "It is about time that we are having a lecture." You prefer to leave that yet for a while in abeyance, till — on being pressed for a reason — the character and trend of the society clear up somewhat. This chafes — as though that were not plain! You point to the editorial: "Not a literary society — nor a society for church-work" — what then? Until this clears, you wish a lecture postponed.

You have another conference with the same party that evening after session in your study. To illustrate that this society is not a legislative body in the Church, neither congregational meeting, Church council or Church committee, you refer to a motion during the previous meeting providing ushers for Sunday evening services, which the chairman of the evening tabled for want of jurisdiction. "But," the reply testily is, "we did not appoint ushers." You say you know it, however — if the society were to attempt to appoint, it certainly would be exceeding its jurisdiction. Then the query: "But we can by resolution request some of the members to volunteer as ushers?" You say, what

has the society to do with that matter? Do you not see that such course would simply be circumvention? Finally he admits he sees it. Above all you demand the right spirit, he avers that it pervades their action. During the week you learn that on that evening after recess on motion of this very party, just before he came to your study, the society both acted as above in the usher matter and resolved to have a lecture. Your judgment and wishes or counsel as "advisory member" count as naught with certain ones who by twos and threes and more drop in to ascertain your position — run straightway — go and do as they list. You may wish to move cautiously, but have now an aggressive force at your back in such combine that is bent on making you move to their time. The note of invitation to lecture is handed you by the Corresponding Secretary at the opening of the next meeting. Under "Reading of Letters" you rise to answer, but desire first to know what position in the Church and relation to pastor and congregation this body claims to occupy? And to make the drift tangible you ask the Chair: Did this society at the last meeting pass a resolution touching ushers for the Sunday evening services? The Chair: Such a resolution was passed. Pastor: By what authority did this society act in this congregational matter? The Chair: Whose duty is it to usher? Pastor: Ordinarily, unless Council appoints others — the deacons. The Chair: Then I think the deacons of this church have been shamefully neglecting their duty in this respect. Pastor: That touches the point in question: What jurisdiction has this society in congregational matters — and right through its Chair to pass judgment on the congregation's officers? Corresponding Secretary: I rise to a question of order, Mr. President, this discussion is out of order at this place. Pastor: Then I propose that this be made the subject of a regular discussion at the next meeting. It is carried by unanimous resolution — the several leaders, however, not voting. On motion the regular debate and reading of the Bulletin at the next meeting are dispensed with. "All things come to him that waits." Now you finally find opportunity in regular manner to confer with your young parishioners as a body on this subject, and you have no doubt as to the issue with them.

What's up? Saturday evening, after 9 o'clock, and the young folks flocking into the basement of the church?

A hurried extra session of the society has been called. You are not long in doubt. The Corresponding Secretary brings you a bulky document purporting to be an answer to your question of the previous evening. It is written in ink by one of the managers and signed in pencil by the Secretary. It says in conclusion: "We want no antagonism" — and desire to know whether you will now deliver "the desired lecture or not? As the society is still in session an immediate reply is requested." This recalls to you the import of certain remarks — seemingly playfully made on the floor of the society: If the pastor does not wish to lecture we can invite someone else. You see the drift is to import some one else over your head. You ask, Why this move? Was it not last night resolved that we discuss this matter on next Friday evening? Corresponding Secretary: Not next Friday — "next meeting," this is the next meeting. Pastor: Shame on you for such subterfuge! You know better. Were Bulletin and debate not dispensed with on next Friday evening for this purpose? Go, tell the society, I shall answer in person on next Friday evening. This, against your advice, results in a joint meeting of the Church Council and the society — and not without turbulence or turpitude — but at its close in a formal resolution on the part of the latter that the pastor shall be recognized as pastor on the floor of the society. On this basis and within limits of its constitution the society is then recognized. It has however become evident now, that one in the council of eleven is playing under cover with certain parties in the society, who have consolidated in set purpose to dety and come off with flying colors. The spirit of depraved moral sense and insolent vindictiveness in persons of their standing and years is a sad commentary on the innate propensity of man brought to bay in the wrong and wanting in grace to confess it.

You have a soul-searching talk with the abetting Council member, and remind him of his duty toward misguided youth, toward the congregation, his pastor, his conscience and God. He is Trustee and Secretary. At the next regular Council meeting he reads minutes into which he has introduced a subjective judgment of his own, which is eliminated. And the question arising as to the force of the society resolution, the Council declares its sense to be, that the society stands under the guidance and supervision of the pastor. The one dissident voice objects and appeals from this interpretation to Synod. The Council at once

forwards the appeal to the District President and requests a committee. Meanwhile this member goes about and foments bad blood. You meet him and two adherents at his house and show them in his presence that his representations to them are untrue. They profess astonishment and admit that they too meant the society resolution in the sense of the Church Council interpretation.

Active opposition seems to narrow down to less than a half dozen — perhaps initiatively to three, the original source of trouble, but these cloak their machinations under the garb of the society and make it their plea and tool. Your stand, on the basis of the XIV Article of the Augsburg Confession, remains, that only in the position of pastor's aids can the young men or such organization in the Church engage in indoctrinating instruction or public reformatory work among the junior membership of the congregation — and this is unstintedly branded un-Lutheran, heterodox, popish. On your next appearance at the meeting of the society you are frigidly ignored, the Chair on adjournment calls on one of the members to pronounce the benediction — and the society organ pumps away at you, as follows:

Society Bulletin, March 18: "All Christians have the right to use the Word of God for the conversion and edification of others. Popery, with its priest-craft, would rob the Christian of his possessions and deny him his God-given right. Against all Romanizing tendencies, which limit the use of God's Word to a select class, let the Christian take a firm stand. It is usurpation the most wicked. Earnest souls should not be deluded by the sophistry of men, who seek to magnify themselves by enslaving others. The inalienable rights of Christians are great, and let no man wrest them from you."

Society Bulletin, March 25: "'To err is human, to forgive divine.' Some errors of judgment and life are often-times excusable on their very face, because the motive that prompts them is not evil. But what shall be said of errors which originate in malicious intent—when men desire, to satisfy some grudge, or wish to rise in the estimation of the people by defaming and putting others down — who would rather see the whole world prostrate if only this would elevate them. This is wickedness without excuse and shows want of Christian principle, lack of true manhood and absence of nobility of soul." To signally em-

phasize foregoing and following the reader turns from the chair and with defiant mien addresses you.

Society Bulletin, April 1: Valedictory of retiring editor: "We have had much to endure because of our active connection with the Society, much unjust reproach and abuse from a source where only support was looked for, yet we trust this injustice, this suffering may yield as yet a pleasant tale to tell. If we learn thereby to endure bravely, to bear patiently, suffer heroically, we will have acquired a very important part of a thorough education for life. Freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of worship, freedom in education and in progress all along the line of moral and material elevation is a glorious legacy bequeathed to us through Luther, and one the society will ever cherish as long as it is worthy of bearing his name. And this is what we hopefully see in its future. If we realize what this involves and adopt such a standard for our actions we can afford to work for the society no matter who opposes it. If what we contend for be good, we can afford to practice it no matter who fails or denies. If any man can say aught against our work let it be done squarely."

Provocation seems to be designedly given to incite to unguarded resentment—for the purpose of turning a sensation into capital. But, pending investigation by a synodical committee, you possess your soul, assured that their overwhelming confidence, who exceed all decent bounds, shall collapse, when they find their pastor's position after all to be but genuinely Lutheran. To the next editor of better mind, you again furnish desired material. In his hand the Bulletin is closed to offensive communications. Attendance has, however, somewhat fallen off, and a special program is proposed to draw to the exercises members of the congregation. At the next meeting, and the following, the committee reports "progress." Managers have the matter in hand, and pastor and society alike are kept in the dark. Finally a committee waits on you to invite the congregation to the open meeting of the society and asks you on the occasion to open and close the exercises with prayer. It is to be a Luther evening, with essays, recitations and orations. Incidentally the committee remark to each other that the Church would be so much nicer to decorate. You are asked who has authority over the Church. You say, ordinarily and for regular purposes—the pastor. In his absence the entire Church Coun-

cil, which with the Minister, according to charter and constitution, are as a body custodians of the Church, whilst the three trustees, as such, are simply a committee on repairs and legally executive under instructions only, but not controllers of the use of the Church and can grant no permission in this direction. You tell them that this their entertainment must be held as first contemplated in their regular place of meeting, the ample lecture room of the Church, where even Synod found it pleasant to hold its sessions. But, if the society desires the use of the Church for the occasion, you will, on request, call the Council and present the matter;—however, you frankly state, you think it will be to no purpose.

No request comes, and you announce the Young Folks entertainment for the lecture room. You are necessarily out of town a few days and on your return find the Church decorated and the general public through the papers, and several literary or church societies of the place by note, invited to a public demonstration in the Church. You learn that members of the committee that had waited on you, instead of reporting to the society that evening, afterwards went to the trustees, and showed their program with your name on it to two of them, and when these saw your name there they thought not of objecting—the third trustee was the opposing member of the Council, who also actively participated in the decoration. One of the two trustees immediately expostulated when he discovered the deception and withdrew his consent. He received reply: "If the trustees had no authority to give permission, they may fight it out with the Council among themselves; we have got the Church, and are going to use it." It leaks out that to use the audience room had been the plan of the managers from the beginning.

It is too late to convene the Council, besides—you do not want a public scandal. The public, the Church, and even the society as a body, know nothing of the masked struggle, growing tenser between insurrection and order. You send a note in protest, stating that you will not invoke the benediction of God on such procedure. This immediately brings the secretary, who, on learning the situation, begs you not to let the unconscious body at large suffer because of the manipulation of the ringleaders. And the consideration puts another phase on the situation. You finally reply: If the president and certain other two, specially implicated in this matter and in the late offensive ar-

ticles in the Bulletin, against which the society, however, raised no protest, will drop in as they come to the entertainment and give you their hand in silent acknowledgment and pledge of better mind, you will absolve the past and take part. The secretary answers, "That is right—I shall see them, but do not believe they will do it." They do not come, and you remain away.

Meanwhile the dissident Council member, preeminent at large in synodical circles, sends the president of synod a lengthy letter of distortion whose purpose is but too evident, and that official remits it to you for your inspection. Your answer in return is your diary of events as they developed. Moves and counter moves follow, finally a mutually selected synodical committee investigates. Instead of following documentary proceedings—or indeed discovering the salient facts in the case—it occupies itself largely with attendant side-issues, but finally centralizes on the basis of the matter,—the position of pastor and council, "that the society stands under the guidance and supervision of the pastor which is now feigned by the managers in chief to have been the sense of the society resolutions from the first. As this is your sine qua non, and the leaders of the opposition now seem to acknowledge its correctness—you submit to the hopeful view of the committee, and are glad that an imminent rupture of the congregation is avoided. By solemn pledge and signature on this basis the past is buried, and peace in future guaranteed. You have one more personal interview with the manager in chief of the young men. It is brief—but to the point. You remind him that God has given him gifts to lead, but that these must be sanctified by the grace of the Holy Spirit and subject to God's appointed order and direction—and he will prove a right hand to his pastor, a pillar of the Church and a blessing to all over whom his consecrated influence extends. But add: You have a strong fault—you will have your way though it break your neck. Do not therefore ever again attempt to lead without your pastor or in antagonism to him; if you do—mark my word: "You will prove a curse to St. M's Church!" He sacredly pledges his hand on honor that he will not again antagonize.

You are sick at heart and weary, and your Council considerately send you off for a three weeks rest. Ere you return, the senior member of the investigating committee is told by the second manager in chief, but prime source of all trouble, that the result is not satisfactory to them.

And while yet away you get intimation of trouble brewing afresh. On your first day at home the secretary of the society brings you two notices, one in German, the other in English—a large page each, to read next day from the pulpit. It announces that the society before adjournment for its midsummer vacation had appointed a committee of ten to perfect plans for a picnic six weeks hence that should exceed in appointments and demonstration anything yet held—and to which pastor, congregation and the two Sunday-schools are most cordially invited. You ask: Is this intended to take the place of our customary annual Sunday-school picnic? Answer: "Why, we thought, if the society holds one maybe the Sunday-schools will not want to hold one. But if they as usual, you reply, do want to hold one? and add: You must not seem to want to forestall. Besides, a six weeks notice is not necessary. I shall not make this announcement to-morrow,—shall first let the Sunday-school act. There is room for both. Or if the Sunday-schools waive theirs, the field is clear for you and your move is not subject to reflection. The subject of a Sunday-school picnic is on the other hand broached by others and accordingly you at the close of the German morning Sunday-school state the question thus: "Shall we have a Sunday-school picnic, or not?" On motion it is referred through the children to their parents. A murmur of disappointment runs through their ranks. Some had been comforted with the hope of one—when the pastor comes back. You say: Children, do not be disappointed—for even if there be no Sunday-school picnic, the Young Folk's Society will hold one later on—and you will all be invited and can then go. Sunday morning comes again, and with it a committee to represent the afternoon English Sunday-school. The picnic matter comes up. Our dissident Council member at once opposes it. You say make a motion. He moves to have no Sunday-school picnic this year, because the society will hold one. The motion is lost, and a resolution is carried to hold such picnic as usual. At this said party grows furious. You say: "Rather than have ill-feeling on account of a picnic let us have none." He promptly rejoins—"and the society shall have none either"—and you dismiss the matter and the school.

As on Sunday previous, you are not present at the afternoon Sunday School. You are called away by official duty. On your return you find the children dismissed, but the teachers and older classes in convention. About

nine-tenths of the society members are there. They have of their own accord been discussing picnic. One is wanted. You are given the chair — and the two oldest members of the society move and second that a joint picnic be held — and that a committee of six from the Sunday Schools and society be appointed to arrange it. One of the movers is our friend and former antagonist. The motion is carried, with but one dissenting voice, and you are asked to name the committee. You select two from each Sunday School and — as a matter of prudence — leave it to the society's committee of ten to select two of their number. The meeting adjourns, and you thank God and take courage. It is the first orderly discussion among the young people, in your presence, and reasonable arrangement of their own accord — since the society movement began. Old time methods seem to be returning. However, you notice in the evening that, for the first time in such conspicuous manner, certain eight or ten are absent from divine service. Next evening as the committee meets the society's appointees of ten announce that they have not been authorized by the society to arrange for a joint picnic, and as the society has adjourned for the summer they decline to act. On that Monday morning, May 1, the adverse Council member had already been out on the street with a paper — declaring: "The preacher must go!" It is found the chief manager within the society, who had pledged himself not again to head antagonism, and who led in the proposal for a joint picnic, is now also active in soliciting signatures. They have overreached themselves.

A committee of elders waits on both, warning them to desist. Not regarding the admonition, they are formally cited before the Church Council, and in open session tried and found guilty as indicted. You adjourn the Council for a week before passing sentence. Meanwhile with a senior elder you make one more effort — lasting half a day — with these two. They affirm their antagonism is not personal. But, as the congregation enjoyed such unprecedented prosperity during the past ten years, they think under a new pastor now it will take another bound forward and lead all the churches in town—however add: Perhaps, though, your position is right after all. You seize on the modus vivendi, and they pledge to again stand shoulder to shoulder by you as at first, and at once to right matters with those whom they misled. At the next Council meeting joint report is to be made of readjustment

and peace. You are content that you prevented precipitate Council action.

But — on the day and evening prior to the Council meeting you accidentally learn that the President and Vice-president of Synod will be present on the morrow. What for? And who called them? A letter, subscribed by parties of similar name to those of Council members, implored them, for God's sake, to come as the pastor was rending the Church! And a telegram followed bidding them come without fail. The letter was written before above settlement — the telegram went afterward, and both with complicity on the part of these two. The officials of Synod and the pastor, named by the opposition on the first investigating committee, appear in open session, and though surreptitiously called, you give them the case. The official verdict strikes home. To wit: Such machinations in the congregation must cease, and this abnormal combine in the Church as primal source of all the trouble must be dissolved. Instead, if a society be desired, the confirmed unmarried youth of the congregation should be organized on a churchly basis under the pastor. The judgment is at once carried into effect by resolution of the Council — notwithstanding the threat: If you pass such resolution you will drive us out of the Church. It is the beginning of the end.

The society, that is such as still adhere, though by its constitution subject to the action of the Council, forthwith withdrew its effects and itself from the church and sought, through meetings and fêtes at the homes of sympathizers and by personal solicitation, to bring under its influence other youth of the fold. Next the nucleus of opposition separately by letter notified the Council that henceforth they will not attend the public services of the congregation or support its treasury, so long as present incumbent is pastor — because they cannot conscientiously endorse his course, and they at once settle dues. The Council promptly accepts the situation as renunciation of church-membership. This is scarcely what was expected. They seem to have judged that they and those whom they influenced to stand by them should count more than a pastor. Council also resolves and has it publicly proclaimed from the pulpit, that membership with such apostate combine — still continued as the original society — is incompatible with church and altar-fellowship or membership with the congregation. This draws the line — and cuts off supplies. The

full reflex effect of their formal notification seems not to have been soberly weighed. Now even pompously intimated recourse to law is shut out — by their own act. Realizing their position as outside of the Church, strenuous efforts are made at home and abroad to have the case reopened — aiming thus in legal effect again to reinstate themselves into membership and be able to continue the fight from within. They are informed that their case has been closed — it will not be reopened; but on tangible evidence of amendment the Church will be ready to hear them.

Amendment is not their purpose — but dominance and the triumph of victory. They have had their day. They have run through the entire gamut of villainous expedients from public insinuation as to mental aberration—to charges of heterodoxy and vituperous calumny of the pastor, and have failed. Yet their turpitude fails them not. You approach the one who was in the Chair when you sought information touching society action in the matter of ushers, and who was thereby in frame of mind to be turned against you, who was then turned, and ask: What personal reason he had against you since the first adjustment for signing the paper requiring you to resign? He promptly replies: "None whatever." Then why did you sign it? He says: "To tell the truth about it, I was mixed up with the others in the matter from the beginning, and felt myself in honor bound to see them safe through with it." You find another drawn away, who in no wise had been connected with the society but was associate of the second leader, and have a talk with him. He finally says: "Reverend, I so enjoyed your sermons that, you know, I scarcely missed an English service for years, and am sorry I did not have this conversation sooner." You hopefully say: "Now you see things in a different light?" He answers: "Yes, but it is now too late!" — He remains under influence of the venom instilled. Other cases are similar. Those in complicity seem held as under conspirators' oath. And the manipulators shrewdly timed their tactics to the manner of party whom they approached. When they dared not be open — they insinuated. Had they antagonized uncovered by a society they could have done but a minimum of harm.

True to the last in the cause begun their dying blast, as it were, is a note of defiance. We read in the public press an account of the society, now dwindled to about one and a half dozen members, on occasion of a banquet

held to celebrate its first anniversary. In this they say: "Cotta Society was organized one year ago among the young people of the Church, and for a while all went well, but opposition to it arose and the society had a turbulent time for a while, but always remained firm and strong as an organization, and now that the members have breasted the storms throughout the year and see brighter days in store for the society, they feel proud of the success they have attained, of the flourishing condition of the society and of the outlook for its future." — It was not yet dead. Such spirit dies hard. It yet led a forlorn battle against Christ's appointments in His Church — but from without. The wreck of souls it made will appear on the Great Day. Thus it works. And this is the logical sequence of the abnormal aggressively obtruding itself — in the form of anarchic confederation within the congregation — on the Church.

5. Additional pointers.

And our experience is not an isolated example in this direction. The like spirit crops out elsewhere. When the constitution for the Central Luther League of Western Pennsylvania was formulated, the pastor who gave it final revision inserted a safety clause — making the pastor of a local society, *ex officio*, delegate, with those elected, to the Central League. Already at the next convention a local society presented a motion to amend by substituting for "*ex officio*" the words "*if elected*." The amendment did not carry — but the effort thus to amend shows the trend toward emancipation from pastoral supervision in combines in the Church. That constitution, however, can be so amended and will be — if the requisite number so elect.

When a few years ago the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church convening at Pittsburg, Pa., was about to take note of the Christian Endeavor Society in their midst and deliberate on bringing it into harmony with Presbyterian Church polity, the committee in charge, so the daily press reported, was cautioned — on account of the strength of the organization and the prominent connection of its membership. It was found that there was strong adverse sentiment abroad on the subject — and umbrage threatened to be taken at anticipated action. The report was deferred — and probably modified, if at all presented.

If a local society, detached from extraneous federation, and subject in its organic law to the congregation, under

abnormal conditions becomes unmanageable — how will the Church hope to cope with an abnormally constituted inter-synodical league at large that is principally beyond its supervision and control?

THE THEOLOGY OF THE GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

Both fortunately and unfortunately German theological thought, as this finds its expression in the researches of the University teachers of the Universities of the Fatherland, has in recent years become a most powerful factor and force in the development of Protestant scholarship and theology throughout the world. To a great extent the Germans have become the teachers of the Protestants everywhere in reference to all newer developments and newer methods, manners and results in scientific research. This influence has been limited to the domain of abstract thought and scholastic investigation; in other departments in which the German Christians excel, e. g. in certain fields of practical work, such as Inner Missions in all of its ramifications, their influence on the outside world has been practically nothing. Indeed even the Germans themselves as a rule are willing to accede to the English speaking religious world the palm in relation to all kinds of practical work, even there where the German method of dealing with certain practical problems is superior and more Biblical than that of the more or less Reformed type of church ideals that prevail in England and America. Thus, e. g. the German theory and practice of mission and evangelization is decidedly more Biblical and sober in its evangelical trend and tendencies than the more enthusiastic but often erratic and not always scriptural manners of the English peoples; yet the Germans are content to acknowledge a superior charisma of the English in this respect and the latter perfectly willing to receive this acknowledgment. There can be no doubt in the case that if the German Christians had at their disposal the sums which the English can command for church purposes and could

develop somewhat more of the tact and practical wisdom combined with the energy characteristic of the Anglo-Saxons, German Christianity, with their deeper insight into Evangelical principles, would more effectively and successfully solve the practical problems that fall to the lot of Christianity. Naturally this would be true only of the positive elements within the German Church, who alone have been and are doing the work of the Church — for rationalists always have been and are yet completely unproductive in the fruits of righteousness — would maintain the ascendancy in the world of German religious thought and life. As matters now stand the leadership and most successful results in the great practical departments of Christianity, especially in the missionary field, must be credited to the English-speaking Christians, but this is not for the reason that they represent a better type of Christianity than the Germans.

To the latter, however, without doubt or debate belongs the leadership in the lines of scholastic research and scholarship. No one fact attests this better than the attendance of foreigners, especially of Americans, at the German Universities. These strangers are sitting at the feet of the savants of the German Universities literally by the hundreds. While the influence of German ideas and ideals in the department of abstract and pure scholarship is very marked in every domain and department it is particularly so in theology. In some other fields, such as natural sciences and mathematics, the scholars of other countries, especially of England and France, have all along been at least the equals of the Germans, it is a recognized fact, that in theological research, especially in the independent investigation of the original sources, in the fearless examination and criticism of the traditional teachings and tenets of earlier generations, and in the determined application of the higher principles of scholarship, namely the search for truth on the basis of objective methods and complete impartiality and with no regard for consequences, the Germans have been the most consistent and persistent in the Protestant world. In this feature lies the strength and the weakness of German theological scholarship. The highest ideal of this scholarship is its scientific character, i. e. a rigid, vigorous and independent search for the truth on the ground of original research in

the primitive sources. The watchword in University circles is "*wissenschaftlich*," which in theology is often practically set up against "*kirchlich*." It is thought the correct thing that claims the theological and Biblical problems can be investigated by the same canons and the same principles of logic that would be satisfactory and sufficient for scholastic investigation in other fields. Our old theologians made it a chief demand that theology should be a "*habitus practicus*" made possible only by the influence of the Holy Spirit. Only a regenerate man could according to their ideas interpret the Scriptures or understand Christian theology. In this regard the demand made on the theological scholar was higher than that made on the student in any other department of research. And this for the best of reasons. The facts and data, the ideas and concepts with which the theologian, who draws his interpretation and his material from the revealed word of truth must deal, do not fall within the world of thought natural to man. As little as a five-year-old child can understand a system of philosophy or of metaphysics, so little can an unregenerate man appreciate the truths with which the theologian must deal. Only he who through the Holy Spirit has been enlightened and made to see and to hear and understand the things that are foolishness to the natural mind and heart is able to deal with them intelligently, fairly and justly. Of the three conditions that made it possible for a man to be a theologian according to Lutheran ideas, namely *oratio*, *meditatio*, and *tentatio*, the last was by no means the least; and experience of the great things of God revealed in the Scriptures must be regarded as the *sine qua non* of a Christian theologian.

This is the factor which modern German theological scholarship to a great extent ignores. Theology is for the German savant an object for critical analysis and the construction of hypotheses and theories exactly as are the facts of history or the phenomena of the fauna and flora of the world around us. Hence not faith and a knowledge by practical experience of the things with which theology deals, but a keen intellect, shrewd discrimination, vivid power of imagination and especially a sharp power of combination of facts and data for the construction of new hypotheses and of

innovations are considered as the chief requirements of a proficient student of theology. An unbeliever, if he possesses the proper mental endowments, may be just as successful a Bible critic as the outspoken believer in the truth of revelation.

This theological principle, or rather absence of principle, is strengthened by a canon of scholarship that has brought great good but also great harm in the ups and downs of the theological thought of Germany. Only he is regarded as a scholar — or at least has the best claims to it — who produces something new, either in correction of an old error or in the production of a new truth, real or imaginary. The ambition, almost frenzy to produce new results, new theories, new hypotheses, is most marked in German scholarship, especially in theology. Not even the best compiler in the world can lay claim to the title of a scholar, no matter how useful and necessary such compilations may be, but only he who is an original investigator. In the nature of the case then, especially in the case of young University docents, who can expect promotion and an appointment to a salaried position only by attracting the public eye to their attainments and achievements, German theology abounds in innovations, often more noteworthy on account of the novelty than their plausibility or even possibility. It is not at all accidental that Germany has been the fountain head of the modern critical school of Biblical research. Here is the field in which the production of new hypotheses was the easiest thing in the world; and this is the reason too why one set of theories is crowding the other into the background. Even many of the positions taken by those autocrats of modern Biblical research, Wellhausen, and Kuenen, have been superseded by other skilful combinations that appeal more strongly to the expectant imagination of the radicalism of the day. In this respect the history of German theology is an interesting commentary on the natural trend and tendency of their scholarship. Some thirty years ago the Baur School of New Testament criticism, which practically undermined the entire N. T. literature and its theology, ruled as absolutely in the German Universities as does the Wellhausen reconstruction scheme of Israel's history and religion now. The indications are at hand that the days of the latter school are also num-

bered, and the only question is as to what kind of critical innovation will be destined to take its place.

The status of the German University teacher favors this independence and this propensity to develop theories utterly destructive even of the fundamentals of Christianity. He is an appointee of the state and not of the church, and the rank and file of the church, as little as the authorities of the church — who again are appointees of the state — have a voice or vote in selecting the men who are to act as University teachers in educating the future generation of pastors and preachers, or have they any control over them or their doings after they have been appointed. No church can depose a theological teacher because his teachings are heretical and even directly contrary to the official confession of the church of the state which has the control of this University. In the University of Tübingen there is at most a single man in the theological faculty who represents the confessional status of the Württemberg church, which recognizes the Augsburg Confession, to support which also the theological professors must give their promise when entering upon their duties, while the other five theological professors are all outspoken adherents of the new critical and destructive theology of the day, at the head of them the venerable Weizsäcker, who even denies the resurrection of Christ as an historical fact. And yet only the government and not the church can do anything to remove such dangerous men. Naturally being thus free from all restraint or oversight or control except that of the state — which has only political interests to watch, German University theologians are all the bolder in the enunciation of new views and radical innovations that are destructive of the very fundamentals of truth and historical evangelical Christianity. The theological savant does not always recognize this feature and characteristic of his teachings, since, as a general rule, the theological men of the Universities are not in touch and tone with the practical work and needs of the church but are book men and find their world in their libraries, in which they live and move and have their being. Their work frequently makes the impression that they regard the Scriptures not as a revelation from God to man given for the purpose of showing him the way to salvation, but rather in the light in which

a student of anatomy, regards a corpse on the table before him, as an object for dissection.

Quite naturally this spirit is not found in the same degree nor is it consistently carried out at each of the twenty universities of the Fatherland. There is no lack of God-fearing theologians at German universities, although they are all more or less touched by the spirit controlling German scholarship in general. There are very few among them who will consent to submit absolutely to the Word and will not claim for themselves to a greater or less extent the privilege and the right to sit in judgment on this Word and even go behind it to judge of its reliability and truth on other basis and grounds than that it is the Word. There is but one university man in Germany for whom even the claim is put forth that he still believes in a verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, and that is Nösgen, of Rostock; while there is not a single Old Testament professorship who believes in the Mosaic authorship of the Penteteuch or that Isaiah 40-66 was written by the great Prophet himself or that Daniel is authentic.

The status of the various universities is different in this regard. Positively Lutheran in the historic sense of the word and as understood in America, there is not a single university in Germany, not even Rostock, although this, the smallest in attendance and in the corps of its professors comes nearest to it, as Mecklenburg, of which it is the institution, is quite pronounced in its Lutheranism. Next comes Erlangen and Leipzig, particularly the former, although according to the constitution of that institution one or two of the professors must be adherents of the Reformed confession. The confessional status of the professors of the theological faculties of the University, depends on the tone and trend of the government. If this is liberal, the appointments to the theological chair will be apt to be the same; if this is conservative, the professors will be apt to be chosen partly on account of the positive character of their convictions. That to a certain extent at least the general character of the churches which constitute the province or the country of which the various universities are the higher institutions of learning, is quite natural, although this consideration is not the decisive factor. Thus, e. g.

Hanover is, according to the laws of its church government, distinctively Lutheran, and in 1866, when the province was annexed to Prussia, the Union state of this kingdom, in which the Lutheran and the Reformed churches are united as one organization was not introduced into Hanover but the old Lutheran consistory was retained, yet at Göttingen, the University for this province, there is not a single representative of orthodox Lutheranism in the faculty, although there are a few, such as Knoke, who holds the chair of practical theology, is pronounced in his evangelical and positive teachings. Again the appointment of only positive men to the faculty at Greifswald is attributable to two causes, namely the positive character of the churches of Pomerania and the fact the Prussian government wanted by this peculiarity to establish a faculty that would attract the students of positive convictions, from the country who otherwise would go to Leipzig or some other non-Prussian University. Other facts in reference to the appointment of theological professors show how much prudential policy and not the conviction as to the spiritual needs of the Church are the decisive factors in making such selections. When several years ago the radical position of quite a number of leading theological professors on the subject of the Apostles' Creed showed to what extent the very fundamentals of Christian dogmas and doctrines were denied by these men, aroused the conservative element throughout the church to fever heat, the government thought it wise to appoint to several of the hot-beds of this radicalism, such as Bonn and Marburg, one or two extra men, who had the reputation of being conservative and positive in their convictions. The government never dreamed of deposing those from office who were ready to overthrow the essentials of fact, but its appointment of conservative men merely meant that both the tendencies (Richtungen), the liberal or radical and the conservative were alike entitled to representation in the various theological faculties, so that the singular phenomenon is presented in some universities that in one audience room a professor will teach the divinity of Christ, while in the very next room his colleague may teach that this is not the case. But as "Lehrfreiheit" or liberty of teaching whatever he regards as the fair conclusions of his investigations

is considered the dearest treasure of the German University this condition of affairs does not at all seem strange to those who make the appointments and control the universities. While the government makes the choice of professors, the names of candidates are submitted by the faculty where the new man is to enter. Generally one of these is selected, so that the new colleague may be congenial to his associates. Occasionally the government ignores their recommendation and makes its own selection. This was done in the case of the conservative appointees at Bonn and Marburg, and the new men have evidently found their new positions anything but beds of roses. They are popularly known as "Straffprofessoren," i. e. professors appointed as a punishment to the radical members who have secured control of the teachings of the University.

In the other Prussian universities, such as Berlin, Breslau, Königsberg, etc., as a rule critical tendencies prevail, although the positive element is not lacking. Professor Seeberg, a pronounced Lutheran from Erlangen, lately went to Berlin as the representative of conservative scholarship, where Baettgen already fills the Old Testament chair as a similar type of a scholar. Leipzig is by no means the Lutheran institution that it was when Kahnis, Luthardt, and Delitzsch attracted hundreds of theological students to that school. Even the new Ritschl school with its pronounced rationalistic teachings has found favor in Leipzig. The most popular faculty is that of Halle, where there are a number of positive men; and the same good attendance at Tübingen is to be attributed to the same cause. In general the institutions where there are positive Christian and Evangelical teachers according to German ideas on this matter, there is also the greatest attendance; while at such institutions as Jena, Heidelberg, and Giessen, where radicalism and rationalism predominate, the attendance is scarcely more than a baker's dozen. This is owing to the fact that the great bulk of the German churches is much more positive than are the majority of the theological teachers. German Christianity as a whole is positive and conservative, although not as pronounced in its confessionalism as the American Lutheran Church regards as demanded by the rights of historic Lutheranism. But the German churches

as a rule have little sympathy with the radical teachings and the universities, and the existence of this chasm between the church and the official education of the pastors is one of the living and burning questions of the German church that yet wants a solution. Whether any solution except the separation of state and church is possible, the future alone must show.

At any rate, German University theology has its strong and its weak sides, its attractive and its dangerous features. Just at present the weak and the dangerous features are in the ascendency manifestly. We can and must admire the independent research and the fearless investigation and the thorough examination of first and prime sources which characterizes German theological scholarship; but must deplore the fact that the subjective tendencies of this research, the radicalism that marks it, the refusal to heed the Word and listen to this as a last court of appeal, the establishment of the standard of "wissenschaftlich" as the ideal of scholarship deprives the fine features of the method and manner of scholarly research of many of those features that would make them useful to the church and to the cause of the kingdom of God on earth. When German theologians once again learn to heed the Word as the greatest of German theologians, Luther, did, then with their fine scholarship they will be able to perform a wonderful work for God and His Church.

MEDICAL MISSIONS.

BY REV. CHARLES A. SCHAEFFER, A. B., HARTFORD CITY, IND.

Whenever and wherever the Church follows the Lord and His ways, she will not fail, but will succeed in her efforts. The Lord Jesus has done all things well and His ways and methods of bringing souls to Himself can not be improved. The Apostles performed their duties as He commanded them and He therefore could work with them and confirm the word with signs following. The rapid progress of the foreign mission work during the last fifty years is due very much to the fact that the missionary boards and the missionaries have learned to adopt one of Christ's methods of gaining the sympathy and hearts of those to be saved

from the power of Satan. They are now making greater use of the powers to heal the body and thereby gain the healed to listen to the preaching of the gospel. The primary object of the Redeemer's work was to save souls from damnation, but this did not exclude the healing of the body of its infirmities. The restoring of the deaf, the dumb, the palsied, the lame, the blind, etc., was to be one of the proofs of Christ's divinity and Messiahship. He said unto the disciples of John who came to ask Him whether He was the promised one: "Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Many souls were drawn to Christ and brought to faith by Him healing them or their relatives of some bodily ailment. The wages of sin came also upon the body and the Savior therefore sought to destroy also this work of the devil. The Lord gave His twelve disciples power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease, and gave them the command to use these gifts and powers. These powers were to prove to the people that their message had the stamp of divinity and truth and were to move the people to give attention to the gospel of Christ. He has in a similar manner bestowed upon Christians the knowledge of the human body and its diseases and of the medical qualities of herbs and minerals.

The foreign missionaries therefore are wise and right in not neglecting the bodily welfare of those to whom they desire to teach the way unto eternal salvation. The adopting of the systematic medical work in our foreign mission-fields is conceded to be one of the most blessed and fruitful helps to this sacred cause. A noted authority on missions says: "No one department probably has been more aggressive or opened more fields hitherto closed than this. It developed into a distinct feature with the establishment of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society in 1840. Since then the advance has been rapid, and in 1893 there was a large force of medical missionaries in every field." It is then only about 60 years since this department of foreign missions has taken a systematic form. Before that time very few, if any, regular physicians and surgeons were sent to foreign mission fields, and no hospitals and medical dispensaries and colleges were established in heathen lands. The number of all these has rapidly increased. "In 1849

there were 39 medical missionaries in all lands, of whom not one was a lady physician. In 1894 the number of medical missionaries is stated to be 400, of whom 80 are lady physicians." A few years ago only a few missionary societies were willing to employ physicians, but now almost all are. In Chicago a home for medical missionary volunteers has been established and the number of such volunteers is increasing every year. This is certainly encouraging, for as a rule not much piety prevails amongst medical students. It has been advocated to establish a medical college in New York in which young men and women should be trained for the mission work.

The men who are engaged in caring for the medical wants of the heathen are of the most learned and successful physicians. Besides this they are men of most noble Christian character and of a sacrificing spirit.

"Among medical missionaries, there are at least two abroad who are the peers of any physicians and surgeons at home. One is Dr. George Post of Syria, who has performed more major cases of surgery than probably any man abroad; and the other is Dr. Kerr, of Canton, of whom the U. S. Consul General in that city remarked that he undertook cases that Philadelphia surgeons would not risk, and is the peer of any living surgeon, and has treated three-quarters of a million of patients. Both of these men could command an income of at least \$1000 a month, and they get little more than that a year."

To give an idea of the number of hospitals and dispensaries which are being established in heathen lands we will cite the number of those in China. "There are in China 100 male and 50 female physicians, 150 male native medical students and 30 female students, 71 hospitals treating many thousands of patients, and the physicians attending yet other thousands at their homes and 111 dispensaries, in which over 22,300 patients are treated. About \$70,000 was spent in medical work last year — 1896."

The churches should put forth greater efforts to increase this department of foreign missions, for the need is great and the benefits are many and paramount. In heathen lands where sin and vice are uncontrolled we find the greatest suffering and the worst forms of diseases. Their mode of living, their superstition, their lack of knowledge of the human body and of medicines, their horrible and repulsive remedies and their cruel treatment of the sick, make sickness amongst them hundredfold worse than amongst us.

The native Chinese physician locates the intellect in the stomach and the greater the rotundity of this part of the body the greater the mental greatness. "Many of their favorite prescriptions are compounded from the dried carcases of snakes, insects and ground bones of the tiger or other strong animals, while it is a mark of filial devotion for a child to cut pieces of flesh from his or her body, cook them and give to parents who are afflicted with disease." Amongst many heathen the sick are believed to be possessed by demons and their bodies are sometimes pierced by needles in order to locate the evil spirit. Their remedies are far worse than their maladies and many die rather of the cruel treatment than of the disease itself. To relieve the heathen of bodily suffering is alone sufficient reason for us to pray and work for medical missions. The need is great, because there are comparatively few physicians, hospitals and dispensaries in heathen lands. It is said that in China there is only one physician to each 2,500,000 of the population. In the United States there is one physician to every 600 people. The need of women physicians is great, for in some heathen lands a male physician would not dare to visit a woman and the women have few opportunities to hear the gospel. Women alone can make known to them the salvation which is in Christ Jesus.

It is wonderful how the medical work opens the doors to the gospel. Dr. Post of Beirut says: "You take the Bible to the heathen, and they spit upon it, or burn it, or throw it aside as worthless and harmful. You preach the gospel to him and he may regard you as a hireling who makes preaching a trade. He may meet your arguments with sophistry, your appeals with a sneer. You educate him and he may change from a heathen to an infidel. But heal his bodily ailment in the name of Christ, and you are sure at least that he will love you and bless you, and that all you say will have to him a meaning and power not conveyed by other lips."

While the patient is waiting in the reception room of the dispensary or the hospital, the gospel of Christ is taught to him. He knows that the Christian physician has greater power to heal him than any of the medicine men of his own people, and being anxious to be healed, he will willingly listen to the gospel, while under other circumstances he might turn a deaf ear to the missionary. A missionary writes: "I have known what it is to preach in the streets, and the markets and the holy mountains, where pilgrims

congregate in the temples, and in all manner of places ; but I do not know any place where preaching is so enjoyable to the preacher and so profitable to those who bear him as in the waiting room of a mission hospital." The unselfish and sacrificing work of the Christian physicians disarms the heathen of his prejudice and proves to him that the religion which can accomplish cures of dreaded diseases and which can move men to sacrifice time, money and even their lives for those by whom they are despised and often persecuted must be a religion superior to theirs. It was so in the time of Christ and the apostles.

It is really true that in many cases God has made Medical missions the key of opening the doors locked to the gospel. Korea was opened to Christianity by Dr. Allen saving the life of the nephew of the reigning monarch. This Christian physician found the young man wounded and bleeding while the native "surgeons" were trying to stop the bleeding by pouring melted wax upon the wound. He quickly applied his skill and saved the life of the dying man. The king learned of it and declared that he must have such surgeons and medicines in his country. He soon founded a hospital and placed Dr. Allen at the head. Before long Christian preachers and doctors were conquering this country for Christ. Dr. Valentine was in Jeypore and made a formal call upon the ruler. He was told that the ruler's wife was very sick and that the native physicians had given her up. He offered his service and was contrary to custom permitted to see the sick woman. "When she was restored to health the husband said to Dr. Valentine: 'What can I do for you?' He said: 'Let me preach the gospel here'. The Maharajah said: 'If you stay here and be my private physician I shall be glad'. He said: 'But I am a missionary of the gospel'. (No missionary had previously been allowed to settle in Jeypore, that great stronghold of idolatry, perhaps one of the greatest strongholds, in Northern India). The Maharajah said: 'But you will be my private physician, will you not?' He replied: 'Yes, but only upon one condition, that you allow me to preach the gospel from one end of the province to the other without let or hindrance.' The Maharajah agreed and Dr. Valentine remained at Jeypore for fourteen years and now the U. P. Church has a large and prosperous mission there."

The medical missionary can invariably secure a hearing and has excellent opportunities to tell the benighted heathen of the salvation in store for him. Even in the Turkish em-

pire medical missions are breaking down the bulwarks which have so long kept out the Christian army of missionaries.

This is another department of mission work in which our synod has not yet engaged. The church must foster this work too, if she is to be faithful to her Lord, who has given the command: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give." We certainly have the men and we have the means. Who of our synod shall be the first man to offer his service as physician and surgeon to the heathen?

1. THESS. 4, 3-8.

BY REV. G. DILLMAN, A. M., FOSTORIA, O.

The above passage of Holy Writ is an admonition to personal holiness, and a warning against fornication and adultery. These sins against the sixth commandment were very common among the Gentiles, and hardly considered disgraceful. Converts to Christianity must look upon them in a different light and avoid them, else they can not progress in holiness, to which they are called.

"For this is the will of God, even your sanctification,"—sanctification in the narrow sense, your personal holiness, and progress in the same. This is God's will. "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." Lev. 19, 2. "That ye abstain from fornication," which the heathen allowed and encouraged, and which, if indulged in by believers, would prevent their sanctification and frustrate the will of God in regard to them. We cannot live after the flesh, and at the same time become holy. "Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body. And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by His own power. Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid. What? know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two, saith He, shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body;

but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." 1 Cor. 6, 13-20.

How can a Christian, knowing that his body is the temple of the Holy Ghost and is to be raised up at the last day, join his body to an harlot and become one body with her? What kind of a temple and resurrection-body would that be? Surely not "a glorious body," but a polluted one, fit for the everlasting fire. "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." Heb. 13, 4. "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. 6, 9. 10.

"That each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor, not in the passion of lust, even as the Gentiles which know not God." Among the Gentiles who know not God, social morality is very lax, marriage is unfashionable and avoided, and the passion of lust seeks satisfaction in fornication. A Christian man who knows God and His commandments dare not do so. He must respect the state of marriage, and not seek to gratify the sexual passion outside of it. He must know how to possess himself of his own vessel, that is, of his own wife, and live with her in the holy and honorable estate of marriage, not in heathenish and brutish free love, which looks upon every female as a lawful prize. "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." 1 Cor. 7, 2. — "To possess himself of," is a correct rendering of ktasthai, from ktaomai, "sich erwerben, verschaffen, gewinnen"; "to get, acquire, obtain, provide." Skenos, "a vessel; spoken of a wife, 1 Thess. 4, 4; 1 Pet. 3, 7." The passage, 1 Pet. 3, 7, is as follows: "Ye husbands, in like manner, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the woman, as unto the weaker vessel."

"That no man transgress," or overreach, "and wrong his brother in the matter: because the Lord is an avenger

in all these things, as also we forewarned you and testified." No Christian man shall transgress the sixth commandment and be an adulterer, reaching after his brother's wife, and wronging his brother in the matter. The sixth commandment is the protection of our brother's or neighbor's wife; woe to the transgressor and adulterer! "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." "The Lord is an avenger of all these things."

"For God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification." God called us from heathen uncleanness, from fornication and adultery so common among Gentiles, to Christian holiness. God's people shall be a holy people. This is especially true of those who minister in holy things. The minister of the gospel must be a clean and holy man, not a fornicator or adulterer. "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." Isa. 52, 11. The stories which come from our new possessions, concerning the immorality of the priests and friars, remind us of the times of the Reformation. But let Protestants also, who think they stand, take heed, lest they fall. Can we, as a nation, teach the Cubans, Porto Ricans and Philippinos purity, chastity, and a high regard for the holy estate of marriage? Hardly!

"Therefore he that rejecteth, rejecteth not man, but God, who giveth His Holy Spirit unto you." The fornicator and adulterer rejects and despises God, who called him to holiness, and who gives us the Holy Spirit for the purpose of cleansing the heart, subduing the sinful passions, and effecting our sanctification. Such rejecters of God and His Word, and destroyers of the Holy Spirit's work, may well tremble in view of the coming judgment. "Whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." "Flee fornication." Seek sanctification. "This is the will of God, your sanctification."

NOTES.

ONE of the most interesting and instructive phases in the religious ups and downs of Germany is the earnest efforts put forth by the representatives of liberal theological thought to reach an understanding and a "modus vivendi" with the conservative thought of the Protestant

Church at large in that empire. It is a fact recognized at all sides that there is a chasm between the innovation spirit that characterizes the theology of the universities and the old fashioned theology of the masses of Protestant Christianity in Germany. The bulk of German Protestantism is evangelical and conservative, in both pulpit and pew, and this fact explains among others the protests, loud and long, that have been heard in recent years against the destructive tendencies as represented chiefly at the university centers by the theological teachers. The latter are recognizing the necessity of trying to bridge over the chasm and have recently adopted various methods for effecting these ends. One of them has been the establishment of the so-called "Ferien" or vacation lectures, especially in Bonn and Königsberg, where pastors were wanted to spend their vacation listening to lectures by theological professors on the newer types of theological thought. The method has not proved a success, partly on account of the small attendance, and partly on account of the excitement caused by the radical character of these lectures. The Meinhold-Grofe controversy in Bonn originated in this way. Another method has been for theological professors to meet with the clergy of a state or province in synodical convention, in conferences, and co-operate in such general church work as the Gustavus Adolphus Society, the "Inner Mission" cause, the Protestant "Bund" and the like; but this method too is proving only a partial success, the representatives of the newer theology finding much opposition in the ranks of the clergy at these conventions. At the late General Prussia Synod, where the universities were officially represented by some of their best men, these were steadily opposed in their positions and numerically outvoted. Journalism has been employed for the same purpose. The "Christliche Welt" of Leipzig recognizes it as the object of its existence to make liberal theology palatable to the general cultured Christian reader. Only a few months ago a theological and literary journal on a somewhat large scale was begun for this very purpose, namely the "Theologische Rundschau," edited by Professor Bousset, of Göttingen. In the introduction to the new monthly the editor says that the chief end of the journal would be "to bridge over as much as pos-

sible the great chasm that has gradually been formed between theological science and the practical ministry." It is interesting in this respect to notice that such efforts at peace ever emanate from the liberal ranks and never from the conservative. The former are willing to permit the latter to live and labor, if only the latter will consent to allow the former the same privilege. In the German Church at large the liberal type of theology is on the defensive and feels this keenly. This is itself a significant sign.

BIBLE students have reasons to be satisfied with the number of valuable aids which are being put at their disposal just now. The great Anglo-American Hebrew dictionary, prepared by Professors Brown, Driver and Briggs, is progressing slowly, but is a masterpiece of careful scholarship and in nearly all respects will more than take the place of the *Thesaurus of Gesenius*. About one-half of the lexicon has been completed. The third volume of König's Hebrew "Grammatik" treats of the syntax and supplies an actual desideratum. It is the first Hebrew syntax on a large scale published, the best up to date having been the revision, by Kautzsch, of Gesenius's well known grammar. Considering that the lack of preliminary detail researches made the preparation of a Hebrew syntax even in our day and date a venturesome undertaking, the work of König, at least as far as the material is concerned, is deserving of a warm welcome. Like so many otherwise excellent productions of German linguistic scholarship, such, e. g. as Dillmann's "Æthiopische Grammatik," in reference to form this new Hebrew syntax could have been better. Its use, however, is enhanced by a copious index. New Testament research too will profit materially by the thorough revision of the standard "Grammatik" of Winer, now being prepared by Professor Schmiedel. This, too, when finished, will practically be a grammatical thesaurus and thus not at all to be classed with the meritorious but rather meagre N. T. grammar published a year or so ago by Blass, the Halle Hellenist. The new Winer is published in pamphlets. The first half, covering the entire subject of forms and the syntax of pronouns and nouns, has already been issued.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

JUNE, 1899.

No. 3.

THE CHARGE OF NARROWNESS.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D. D., COLUMBUS, O.

I.

We Lutherans are accustomed to the scorn and contumely of the world. We would not be true Christians if we were not. Enemies beset us on every side and attack us from every quarter. We are used to it. But that does not mean that our intellect or our hearts are closed against all presentations of truth and righteousness and love that may come from opponents. We hear them and heed them and weigh them, and reject them when they are found wanting. The latter is what so often proves an offence. Those who maintain the error have no pleasure in its condemnation, and often no love for those who are constrained by truth and righteousness to pronounce it. They retort, and at least in some cases wreak their wrath, by charging us with narrowness. Sometimes they mean by this that our hearts are not broad enough to love wrong equally with right, about which we of course care as little as when we are charged with narrowness because we do not love the odor of a skunk as we do that of a rose. Sometimes they mean that if we had more knowledge and more grace we would think differently. That is a more serious affair. Narrowness is then a charge which it is difficult to answer. When we are told that we do not know more than we ought to know or that we are no better than we ought to be, how can a modest Christian do otherwise than at once and in bulk admit the job-lot impeachment? Or when in a controversy the allegation is fired at us that our opponents have more learning in their heads and more love in their hearts than we, what shall we say? It may be so, and seemingly we

ought to fall, though we are neither hit nor hurt. The charge of narrowness is often very convenient, and is one of the favorite sophistries where sound argument fails.

But this is not designed to assert that it is always illegitimate. It would not prove so effective if there were nothing at all in it but falsehood, and bitterness, and desperation that seizes any pretext to ward off the shame of defeat. Not the falsehood, but the element of truth that is in it appeals to the judgment of the community and serves to entice to its acceptance, error and wickedness and all. That is what makes error so dangerous in the Church, because so seductive. Naked infidelity and bold scoffing at revealed truth, however strongly it may appeal to man's unregenerate nature, never appeals as effectually to the mind of church people as the false doctrine sugar-coated with scraps of revealed truth and rendered palatable by pious phrases. The truth in its power and its beauty is so apt to hide the lie in its impotency and ugliness from the view, and all the more so when the learning and love of the errorists are humbly and charitably conceded, as it is rightfully expected of Christians. They admit that they do not know everything and that their love is not perfect. They would not be intelligent believers if they did not admit it. But every person who reflects at all, even if he is not a Christian, perceives how illogical the thinking is which assumes that this admission is the concession of the point in controversy. We may err: that is human, and neither we nor others are exempt from this infirmity that sin has brought upon our nature. But that is not at all the point in dispute between us and infidels, nor between us and errorists who profess to be Christians. As far as that point is concerned we concede everything and want no controversy. If opponents in their estimation have mightier intellects and broader learning and larger love, we can only praise the Lord that He has given great gifts to men, and deplore the unwise and unhappy use which they have made of them in setting themselves against the good Giver. We distinguish, as in the gift of intelligence He has taught and required all men to distinguish, between things that are different. If a man knows much and does little, he does not amount to much. And so if a person has great abilities and vast learning and grand opportunities, and with all his gifts only produces error, which even the least gifted under the control of sin could produce just as well, he certainly is not a majesty that could set all rational thinking aside and command absolute submission. The question in controversy always remains the same, who-

ever may be biggest. The charge of narrowness when we insist on right and truth is stupid on the face of it. For the question is not who is greatest, but who is right? And that question cannot be decided by the authority supposed to attach to human greatness, least of all when the interested party claims such greatness for itself and denies it to others. That your neighbor thinks himself bigger and better than you and on that assumption concludes that he is right and you are wrong, is a very cheap way of settling the dispute. You may not be willing to debate that irrelevant point with him, although it would be easy to show that his presumptuous self-exaltation and irrelevant logic detracts not a little from his asserted magnitude of mind and virtue. It is enough for a Christian to see and to declare that this cheap process does not settle the question of righteousness and truth, which are not dependent on the greatness or littleness of creatures, but on the mind of the Creator. Even in matters of money, which are comparatively of small account as to the values involved, the principle of right is maintained against all pretensions of superiority or inferiority in other respects. When a man has a claim for a day's labor against another, it is a matter of indifference whether that other is a king or a scholar or a mechanic; he asserts his right, and the debtor only makes a fool of himself by asserting that he owes nothing because he has more authority, and knows more, and owns more, than the poor laboring man who wants his wages. The poor laborer may in all these respects admit everything that is claimed, but he cannot see how that should change the case, and continues to assert his right and demand his money. His reply to all subterfuges and sophistries is: You are higher in society and more learned and more wealthy, and I am poor and unlearned and may be narrow in thought and influence, but you owe me a day's wages and I want it. He adheres to his right, and will not be diverted from this by silly irrelevancies, which might confuse and mislead him if getting his money were not so important a matter to him and his family. Much more is the insistence on truth and righteousness a matter of great concern to the sincere and earnest Christian, who knows that his own and his fellowman's welfare in time and eternity depends on the revelation given us in the Bible. Others may be more learned and more charitable in their own estimation, and the assumption, as regards persons judging against persons judged, may in humility be conceded; but the point in question is truth and righteousness. After all concessions are made, the question still is, who is right

in regard to the matter in dispute? Proud and self-conceited and fatuous assumptions settle nothing.

Both for the sake of completeness of view and of safeguarding against misapprehensions, another aspect of the matter seems to demand notice. When those who oppose us, whether as Christians in general or as Lutherans in particular, put forth the claim that they have superior learning and higher love on their side, we have expressed our readiness to make concessions on that point. We do this for the twofold reason, first, that Christian humility never makes great pretensions of superior grace, much less of superior natural endowments and laborious acquirements, and thus never has the impulse to oppose the claims of others in this respect, and secondly, that whatever may be the gifts and attainments of opponents, this has nothing to do with the decision of the questions in dispute about the way of salvation, which can be settled by no authority of man, however learned and great, as against his fellowman, however illiterate and little. In the questions of truth and right no human authority can be decisive. Even when it is recognized that a certain probability is established by the fact that superior learning favors a scientific tenet or superior piety favors an ecclesiastical practice, nothing is decided and the question is still open. It is only fair to admit that those who are most learned on the subject under consideration are most likely to be right, and that in a question of Christian life those who have most love are most likely to be moved in the right direction and into the right course. Probabilities thus arising may legitimately be taken into account and accepted for what they are worth. But their value can never reach beyond securing attention for the cause presented through respect for its advocates, and it is sheer sophistry to urge them as arguments against the force of plain proofs on the other side. The authority of great names may be cited in favor of murder when honor is thought to be at stake, as the authority of great names may be cited against the Bible and the Savior. There may be a difference of opinion as to what are great names, and to some the authority in question will seem of higher worth than it can to others. But in the most favorable aspect the authority could only induce an intelligent mind to examine the case, supposing that this presents any new aspects which have not received due consideration in the previous study of the whole subject. It can never do more than this, because rational souls want proof of propositions which are not self-evident and which they are asked to accept, even when authority has led them

patiently to bear; it cannot even do this when the cause for which it contends is based on a principle which has already been examined and rejected as fundamentally false. Reasonable people must not be expected by other rational beings to be such fools as to examine anew the grounds on which they believe daily bread to be needed whenever a crank denies such necessity and gets a great name by the sophistry which supports his denial. "What fools we mortals be" is illustrated in the case of the "Christian Science" craze, which has neither Christianity nor science to support it and which, if it were at all a consistent system of thought, would be constrained by logical necessity to deny the need of daily bread, and thus greatly widen the scope of "social reform." It may seem narrowness to the advocates of such science that Christians shun the folly and scientists laugh it to scorn, but there is no wrong in their treatment and no help for it. That two and two make four is settled for everybody, and that Christ is the Savior of the world is settled for Christians; and if it is not settled for everybody, so much the worse for them. Is it a duty that we owe to our fellowmen to stop and consider and put our certainty into abeyance, whenever some authority may venture the statement, that in some other planet two and two may not make four and that in itself this conviction may not be true after all? And is it the requirement of fairness to admit that perhaps we have no Savior; that He whom by the grace of God we adore as our blessed Lord and Redeemer, in whom is all our comfort and joy in the present and all our hopes of happiness in the future life is no more than a good man, if He ever existed at all; and that the Holy Scriptures, which we have regarded as the Word of our God, and whose communications we therefore believe, is only a human fabrication? Reason forbids us to concede that two and two could make five, or any other number but four, and faith forbids us to concede that there is any other name under heaven given us by which we could be saved from the sin and death that is upon us, but that of the name which is above every name — the blessed name of Jesus. Is it not hence as clear as sunlight that certainties of the human mind can not be surrendered when great names are mustered in opposition, and that the charge of narrowness is an entirely relative matter that has little meaning when the range and scope are not defined? An imbecile cannot see what the intelligent person sees, and the infidel cannot see what the believer sees. The judgment of each will be according to the scope of his vision. The intelligent person will therefore seem a fool to the unbeliever.

And when authorities are mustered on the one side or the other, something else than their name among the circle of their adherents or the crowds that may be gathered around them must decide. The right and the truth is not dependent on human opinions or majorities, but upon the Word of the Lord, which is the norm of the final judgment. Narrowness consists in not taking all into account. It is worth while to look into the matter, and endeavor to ascertain whether the narrowness is not really on the side of those who raise the charge against us.

Considerate readers will observe the difference between the question, whether an individual who claims to know more or have more than his opponent, and the other question, whether his principles and sentiments tend to make wise and better men and have shown their greater power in the superior scholarship and philanthropy which they have produced. If an infidel confronts a Christian, or a Romanist confronts a Lutheran with the sweeping argument: I am more learned than you, and therefore know better, and I am more largehearted than you and am therefore right — you are narrow in head and heart and therefore wrong: what shall the humble Christian say? Only this: I am not a good judge as to which of us is the greater, and am perfectly willing that you should be, though your claim by no means proves it; but that is not the question between us, and on the question that is in debate I have reasons for my contention which I humbly beg you to hear, even if you are the better scholar and better philanthropist. The only claim that is thus humbly put forth, while in the interest of peace all the opponent's immodest self-laudation is allowed to pass, is that the point in dispute is within the compass of that narrowness which is charged against us, and that we are therefore not presuming to speak on a subject of which we know nothing and in which the love which is in our hearts has no concern. The concessions made cannot settle the question at issue, as the claims themselves cannot settle it; if they did, humility would not make the concessions. Therefore in the second question presented it does not make them, as it has not the reason to make them which moves the Christian in regard to the first. If an infidel or an errorist asks me whether he is not my superior in learning and in love, in view of the limitation of my learning and the insufficiency of my love to execute the perfect will of my loving Lord, I have little to say in reply, especially when I con-

sider the prevailing difference of view in regard to the matter involved. Let the opponent have all the comfort that there is in the proud conceit of himself, so long as he does not by such folly injure the cause of righteousness and truth. But when he asserts that his party of infidels or errorists have absorbed all the erudition and all the charity that exists in the world, and that he and the like of him are the people, and wisdom will die with them, we as rational beings can make no concessions, because we have no reason for it, but have abundant reason to repudiate and resist such proud presumption, which is at once ungodly and unmanly. Then it is not a question as to your bigness or mine, but as to the research and the thought and the love to God and man of the different parties. We cannot concede that infidels have all the science and all the philosophy and all the learning and all the philanthropy of the world on their side, although they naturally have much of it, seeing that Christianity is not a product of nature and the natural mind does not favor it and cannot rationally be presumed to favor it. Neither can we concede that errorists in the Christian Church have all the advantage in this respect, although they certainly have much of it, seeing that our corrupt nature of necessity favors everything that gives honor to this nature and helps it to maintain itself, and of course opposes everything that tends to humble it and to exalt the grace of God unto salvation in Christ our Lord. We do not propose to muster the forces of Christianity against those of the enemies of Christ, and the forces of the Lutheran Church against those of erring churches. That does not lie within the scope of this article. But we do maintain, and, if it should be demanded, declare our willingness to furnish the proof, that Christians are in no respect inferior in scholarship and philanthropy to infidels and errorists, and that Lutherans are in no respect inferior to erring Christians who oppose them. In this regard we make no concessions, and see no reason why any Lutheran should make them. It is a false modesty, and therefore a modesty that is not in harmony with Christian faith, and accordingly has its foundation only in the flesh, when infidelity is admitted to have all right thinking, and sectarian error all sound reason on its side. We can admit the advantages which the flesh has over the Spirit, because in the human race the flesh is universal and the Spirit is the possession of only a little flock; but we cannot admit that this proves anything in

regard to the question of intellectual or moral superiority. The proof of this must be furnished by facts, not by partisan bias and prejudice, which in the last analysis is only a form of self-laudation that gives no honor to any person or party.

In all this discussion we have not lost sight of another element in the case, though we have not brought it fully into view. We must now lay proper stress on it. Narrowness is relative, and alleged breadth may therefore be very narrow. One may see only the things in the valley in which he lives and know nothing of people beyond the mountains: he may be narrow enough to think that beyond them there are no people. Another may know that this globe is large and that a variety of races dwell on it, who has no knowledge at all of such creatures as we who write and read this article: he may be narrow enough to make no account of us in all his thoughts. A third may have a larger knowledge of the nations of the earth and its inhabitants, and unfortunately have not the least knowledge of the destiny of mankind, and no idea of the future world, and of our existence beyond these clods and heartbeats. The first is evidently narrow; but if the range of his vision includes the duties which man owes to his fellowman, is not his a larger view than that of the man who recognizes the fact that there are people living beyond the mountains, but practically sees only the circle in which he moves, and finally only himself as the center of that circle? And if another has a wider geographical and political range and includes a larger number of topics in his consideration, is he not narrow when he refuses to take into account the final result in the consummation of all things? One may be very narrow in one respect while he is very broad in another, and one may be very broad in one respect while he is extremely narrow in another. These are relative matters, and the consideration of them must induce reasonable people to see that there must be some standard of judgment other than the mere natural knowledge, or natural feeling, or natural force of the individual will; and that any combination of persons agreeing on the basis of natural knowledge or sentiment or volition cannot, by any authority that human reason could recognize, decide the questions which the human soul wants decided before it can have peace. The authority that decides is above humanity, which all ought to see when once human intelligence perceives how all is wrecked by sin.

But it is this sin that makes the trouble between us and the skeptics and infidels who oppose the Church of Christ in general, and the errorists who oppose the Evangelical Church of the Reformation in particular. The main question that always recurs is whether the human mind, which is made for truth and righteousness, is in a right condition to accomplish its creative destiny. Infidels can not appreciate this question. To them it does not occur, and therefore can cause no trouble. Of course as it seems to them their reason is all right, because in the nature of the case to it the exceeding sinfulness of sin cannot be apparent. And when controversies recur between us and errorists, the reason of our common humanity asserts itself. That this reason of ours belongs to our nature, and that our nature has suffered greatly by the fall, is not brought impressively before the consciousness, because, in the first place, man in his sin tries to appear just, and, in the second place, there is much in his corresponding action that seems just and accordingly tends to mislead.

Our contention therefore is that the mind of man can not reasonably be regarded as the ultimate rule and standard of truth. He may err, and his error may be fatal. Whether he has erred is not decided by the possibility of error. The question must be open for examination, whether he has erred or not. But that always presumes a standard beyond the powers of our own reason. To that we must finally appeal. Such a standard is found only in the Word of our God. Our judgments and our tastes and our feelings have no rights as against such a standard, because it is the foolish appeal of the creature against the Creator, of man against God. No human reason in its normal state can otherwise than repudiate such palpable folly. All that it can do to maintain its appearance of reasonableness in its opposition to the truth, as the divine standard establishes it, is to deny that there is a God, or that He has given any revelation of His will, or that the Bible sets forth that revelation, or that man can have any certainty of its content and meaning. Large room is thus left for infidel and heretical denial and evasion.

Atheists can make a plausible argument against us by denying that there is a God, and that accordingly there is any authority over them as rational beings who are capable of judging and deciding for themselves; and when we appeal to the innate principles of our nature, and to the history and experience of all peoples, to show that only the

fool can say or hath said in his heart, there is no God, they can adduce another plausible argument against us by claiming their individual sufficiency and denying the authority of other men, whether of the past or the present, to hold it over them. That they are against God and man weighs nothing in opposition to the assumed supremacy of their own will. With loud boasts of breadth they charge us with narrowness when we try to confine them within the limits which God has fixed for His creatures and within the bounds of reason, with which He has endowed the human race, and for whose dictates man was designed to have respect. Our wider scope, which comprehends not only the individual, but all humanity, and beyond the doings of men looks at the government of God working out His purpose in the creation and the creature, to such cramped and contracted specimens of humanity seems narrow!

Another class is constrained to admit that there is a God, but denies that He has given any other revelation of Himself and of His will than that which creation, or at most this in connection with His providence and the history of His creatures, furnishes. The thoughts of God are to some extent declared in the things which He has made, and the mind of man finds noble employment in the endeavor to read these thoughts. Would that scientists generally appreciated their great calling and learned more intelligently to labor for its accomplishment! But when they deny that this is all that God wants us to know and all that we can know of His will, their eyes are holden and their outlook is contracted. What a pity, when the circumstances are such as to spur on to a wider view! But when we, who are made acquainted with a larger and more perspicuous revelation, express our faith in the supernaturally uttered will of the Lord, they charge us with narrowness, because we recognize the broader and deeper wants of the soul and look through nature up to nature's God, and desire more light and gladly use it when the Lord of all the earth, seeing our need of it, in mercy gives it. Our narrowness consists in our refusal to shut our eyes when the light shines, and our offense is that we refuse to share the lot of those who sit in darkness and thus to refuse them our sympathy.

A third attempt to fasten the charge of narrowness on us pertains to our acceptance of the Bible as the means of communicating to us the revelation of heavenly truth and the bearer of the light which we need. Again a plausible

argument is made, because again there is an appeal to human nature, whose power of proof is recognized, but whose corruption, because of which that power is in various respects invalidated, is overlooked or denied. Suppose that there is a God, it is argued, and that a revelation from Him is needed to give us light and guidance in our life on earth, is it not palpable narrowness to confine that revelation to the one Book, when there are other books that claim to be such a revelation, and myriads of people who accept them? In the nature of things we Christians are at a seeming disadvantage in such a debate: first, because the question is so complicated that a large number will always be incapable of finding their way through the entanglements; and secondly, because that which is finally decisive can be appreciated only by Christians. We do not desire to conceal the concession to infidels which this apparently involves. Behind the cloud of dust which they have raised they may claim a clear spot on which they stand, while all else seems obscure. But is it not really because the strip of land which they occupy is so narrow, and because their view is so contracted, that the large territory which is beyond it is hidden from their eyes? And yet we make some concessions. We do claim for the Bible that it is the only revelation which God has given to man, and thus with a seeming narrowness set it against all pretended revelations as alone authoritative; and we admit that not all men have faith, by which alone this claim can be fully appreciated and established, and thus with a seeming narrowness comprehends in our view only a portion of the human race. We cannot here enter upon an elucidation of the very complex subject. But in view of the fact that no other religion puts forth the exclusive claims characteristic of Christianity, that no other book provides for the pressing needs of all humanity as does the Bible, and that the fundamental want of peace for the soul in the present and in the prospect of the future is met only by the Gospel of Christ, is it not deplorable narrowness to exclude an earnest consideration of the Gospel truth, which reaches far beyond the narrow thoughts of men and the narrow confines of time into the broad realms of eternal truth and everlasting bliss? Christian narrowness is only the breadth of the truth that makes men free and gathers them into the broad realms of eternal glory.

Still, in the fourth place, a further effort is made to press the impeachment of narrowness against us. It comes

not from infidels against Christians, but from Christians of one denomination against Christians of another. As Christians are charged with narrowness in their opposition to infidels, so Lutherans are charged with narrowness in their opposition to errorists. Like the others, against whom we earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, they too are able to give their charge some plausibility. Are there not others besides Lutherans who are Christians, and have they not as good a right in the world and in the church as the Lutherans? And is it not shamefully narrow on the part of these to make Lutheranism the final test? That makes an impression. But let us not take fright and become confused. We are acquainted with that kind of rhetorical argument. Is it not shamefully narrow to set up Christianity against the judgment of the world and make it the final test? If our eyes are good, we can see that this proves nothing. The decisive question remains untouched by all such suggestions and intimations, captivating to some and injurious to others, but in no case promotive of truth and righteousness. The Lutherans have experienced enough of human sin, and of the grace of God in Christ pardoning all and crowning us with blessings notwithstanding all, to be modest in everything that pertains to ourselves and to make no great pretensions to wisdom and righteousness as realized in the individual. We are therefore ready to make concessions in this respect to any person or party that desires it and presents any rational grounds for the desires. Not accidentally, but just because they are such, Lutherans are not disposed to claim or assert personal superiority. In their mind it is not impossible that Romanists and Protestants who reject Lutheranism are more learned and more self-denying than many of their brethren in the Lutheran Church. Sincere Christians understand that. But to a mind intent on truth this settles nothing. If a man who denies that Christ is the Savior of the world knows more and does more than I, must I, with the recognition of this, admit that Christ is not his Savior and mine? O, my Redeemer, no! He is my Savior for all that. Some are indifferent about this truth, and some deny it. But it is the eternal truth of God notwithstanding, and is therefore that according to which, in the final consummation, the decision that settles all accounts forever shall be made. And if another man, though he be a Christian, and I acknowledge him to be, in regard to his devotion to the truth as he understands it, a more devoted

man than my work can justify me in claiming to be, denies my portion of the truth which the Gospel sets forth and which has by the grace of God become precious to my soul, can his learning and his selfdenying proof of his sincerity make the Word of God of none effect? To adhere to that Word will seem narrow to many, but it is the Word of the Lord, according to which the whole universe is governed and by which all intelligent creatures shall be judged. Upon the subordinate questions that must be taken into account, this is not the place to enter. But there is nothing in them all that could change God's demand of righteousness and God's provision for the salvation by grace in Christ of sinful creatures who lack it, as is the case with us all. We Lutherans do not trust our own reason; all the more do we trust the Word, which gives us light on matters beyond the scope of reason, and which makes sure in things pertaining to the soul's eternal destiny. It makes us sure, for by the grace of God we believe what it tells us. That is generally head and front of our offending. The devil and the world and the flesh are of one accord in their renunciation of all that lies above the sphere of nature and in the subsequent rejection of all grace. The reason is plain. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." No doubt a colony of blind people would, if a man who sees came among them, pronounce him narrow in maintaining the truth of his intuitions and reflections against the seemingly wide experience and judgment of the whole community. But he sees all the same, and has no reason to put out his eyes in order to escape the charge of narrowness, especially as to him it is so easy to see where the narrowness really lies.

How difficult it is to refute such a charge is thus apparent. It has implications which Christians have no mind to resent, but of which their enemies make capital. How can we answer the railing accusation that our opponents have more learning and more love than we? Those who make it cannot understand how the knowledge of Christ, which an unlearned child of God may have, is superior to all the science which man's study of nature, with all his learning and all his logic can reach, and how, with all its seeming narrowness in excluding the whole world of human endeavor in thought and will as an efficient cause in working out the eternal blessedness of our race, it can, as it includes time and eternity, be the broadest of all ob-

tainable learning and the widest of all possible human charity. Nor can we, with any hope of convincing them, urge that we have a source of knowledge and of power which they do not possess and the lack of which renders their whole contention narrow. The difficulty is the same as that of showing the blind man that things are not as they seem to him. Nay, it is greater; because the blind are easily brought to acknowledge their blindness, while the natural man is not easily brought to admit the things which lie beyond the earthly vale in which he lives, and to recognize the narrowness which prevents his outlook into the human possibilities provided and presented by grace. Indeed it is taken as an insult when we suggest that men of miraculous learning do not see what any Christian believer sees without such learning. And so to the narrow we must be content to seem narrow.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

THE NATURAL RESULT OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD, OR
JUSTIFICATION, IS A HOLY LIFE: Chapters VI-VIII.

He who is Justified has Died with Christ unto Sin, and, hence no more Serves Sin: Ch. VI.

A. *The Justified have Died with Christ unto Sin: Verses I-II.*

If where sin has become abundant, grace still more has become abundant (v. 20), it might seem as if the conclusion ($\tauί \; μά\; \xi\mu\bar{ο}\mu\bar{s}\nu$) could correctly be drawn that we should, or at least might, remain in sin, in order to give grace an

Vv. 3 sqq. Baptism is, in the normal state of the Church, the normal means of regeneration, or of bringing a man into that intimate connection and union with Christ that makes him a Christian (John 3, 5; Matt. 28, 19). As such it is the means and source of justification on the one hand, and of sanctification on the other. In the present section of our Epistle baptism is regarded in the *latter* respect, viz. as the means and source of *sanctification*. This presupposes justification, but is not identical with it. In justification God *imputes* to us the merits of Christ, or His righteousness;

opportunity of becoming abundant (1). But that would be an impious, blasphemous inference ($\mu\eta\gamma\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\omega$), and at the same time would be in contradiction to the whole state and nature of a Christian; for how can a man that by death has severed all his former relation to sin, still live in sin? (2). Now to every one that doubts that a Christian, that is, a justified person, is in this very position, this can be clearly proven by his baptism ($\eta\ \alpha\gamma\tau\omega\epsilon\tau\epsilon$: or, if you do not see this, *do you not know?*). Baptism puts a man into the most intimate connection and union with the triune God ($\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omega\epsilon\iota\zeta$: Matt. 28, 19), hence also with Christ and His vicarious saving work, above all with His death, the climax and crown of this work, so that he has done and suffered what Christ did and suffered in his stead. But Christ died to do away with sin, to take away not only its guilt and punishment but also its rule and dominion; and so every Christian has with Christ died unto sin to do away with it in every respect, to have nothing any more to do with it, to escape both its fatal consequences and its polluting service (3). From this it follows ($\alpha\omega\omega$) that by baptism we have also been buried with Christ; for burial is the natural result and at the same time a proof of death. Whoever is buried, is surely re-

in sanctification God *makes* us righteous by giving, nourishing, and preserving to us a new life. Baptism is the divinely-appointed means for kindling faith and giving to it all the merits of Christ; and thus it is also the means and source of justification and sanctification. For justification can only take place, and surely takes place, when the merits of Christ have been appropriated by faith; and sanctification can only take place, and surely takes place, where faith and, inseparably connected with it, the Holy Ghost dwells in the heart. — With regard to the *form* of baptism our present section does not determine anything; for it does not teach what baptism by its form *signifies* and symbolizes, but what it *does* and gives as the divinely-appointed means of bringing man into union with Christ and all His vicarious work. Hence vv. 3 and 4 do not *rest* on immersion as the *necessary* form of baptism, though they may *refer* to it as the then *usual* form.

V. 2. *Oιτινες*: we that are *such persons as*, etc.

V. 3. When Christ, as the representative and substitute of the whole human race, died on the cross, all men died in Him and with Him *objectively*. When a man is regenerated in and by baptism, the normal means of regeneration, this objective death of Christ, as the atonement for his sins and the meritorious cause of justification and salvation, becomes his own, is imputed to him, through faith, whose kindling is identical with regeneration. But

moved from his former life and connection. So our burial with Christ that has taken place by baptism into His death, has totally and entirely put an end to our connection with our former sinful life: that is its import and meaning. But just as Christ did not remain dead, but was raised from the dead by the majestic power of God to live a new life, a life in which He no more sustains His former relation to sin, no more bearing it and suffering for it: so we Christians by baptism also have become partakers of Christ's resurrection to a new life, so as to be enabled, and at the same time bound, to live a life altogether different from our former, sinful one (*ὑπὲ καίνηται ζωής*: 4). For if by baptism we have come into such an intimate connection with Christ that His death has become ours also in this sense that we have died spiritually as he has died bodily, we shall surely also be partakers in His resurrection, rising spiritually as he rose bodily (5). And of this we can be the more sure since we know by our own experience that in and by baptism, or by

in and by regeneration man also dies *subjectively*, spiritually, dies unto sin as his lord and master, becomes a new man, not only objectively, in the judicial view of God who imputes to him the merits of Christ appropriated by faith (justification), but also subjectively, in himself (sanctification). *Οἳστι*: all who; no exception.

V. 4. *Εἰς τὸν θάνατον*: best construed with *τοῦ βαπτίσματος*, as in v. 2 with *βαπτίσθησεν*; and not with *συνετάχθησεν* in the sense of: into death as our state and condition = so that we now are (spiritually) dead.

V. 5. Literal translation: *For if we have become grown together with the likeness of his death, certainly we shall also be of his resurrection.* That which is like unto Christ's death, namely, spiritual death, has become ours so intimately as if we had grown together with it; *i. e.*, in and through baptism we have really and actually died spiritually, as surely as Christ has died a natural death for us. This the Apostle says, presupposing, as he can because writing to Christians, that baptism has been received in the proper spirit, *viz.* by faith. In the last clause of this verse it is not necessary to supply anything: to be of Christ's resurrection means to rise (spiritually) as He has risen (bodily). Still, it is perhaps better to supply from the first clause the words "grown together with the likeness" before "of his resurrection"; the likeness of Christ's (bodily) resurrection is, of course, our spiritual resurrection. The Future tense (*ἐπόμεθα*) does not, in this connection, refer to something (the resurrection of our body) that will take place at some future time (at Christ's coming for judgment), but, here as so often (comp. 3, 20, 30), denotes a rule that always will hold good.

regeneration and conversion, our inborn, sinful nature has been crucified, put to death in a similar way as Christ's humble body was crucified, in order that our body, in so far as it has been an obedient instrument in the service of sin, might be abolished and destroyed, so that we might no more be slaves of sin (6). For he who thus has died, is justified from sin also in this sense that it can no more rule him as his master (7). And if we thus have died with Christ, we are sure that we shall live a new life, just as He does (8), knowing that Christ after His resurrection no more in any sense is in the power of death (9), since the death that He died in consequence of having become our representative and substitute, being a perfect atonement for our sin, severed His former relation to sin once and forever, so that His present life is a life simply in relation to God, and no more to sin (10). And in conformity with this life of Christ

V. 6. *Συνεσταυρώθη*, scil. τῷ Χριστῷ: when by baptism we come into the most intimate union with the death that Christ suffered for us, by regenerating faith appreciate Christ's atonement as our own, then we die spiritually, or our old man, our sinful nature, is crucified. "The body of sin" is by some (e. g. Philippi) understood as meaning sin itself, considered as a mass, a body or organism, of which the individual sinful lusts are, so to say, the members (comp. Col. 3, 5); we, however, with the majority of commentators, prefer the usual signification of "body" and understand the body that by nature is in the possession and under the dominion of sin (comp. v. 12), just as 7, 24 speaks of "the body of death". The whole context represents us, our sinful nature, as dying unto sin, not sin as being annihilated or abolished. "Body" (*σῶμα*) and "flesh" (*σάρξ*) differ as the *organism* differs from the *material* of which it consists; here, in connection with the service of sin, evidently the former term is the more appropriate.

V. 7. Οὐ *ἀποθανών* cannot in this connection refer to physical death, since by it no man, in any proper, biblical sense, is "justified"; in the context it naturally refers to the spiritual death spoken of before and afterwards. *Δεδικαιώται* *ἀπό*: is justified from, is pronounced just so that he is free from sin in every respect, from its dominion as well as its curse.

V. 8. To be understood in the same way as vv. 5 and 11. The matter is so important that the Apostle expresses it in different ways. *Πιστεύομεν*: we believe, are confident, trust. We can be sure, and are sure, that God will never do only half of what is to be done. "We shall also live" (*συζήσομεν*): the Future tense to be understood as in v. 5.

after His death, we as Christians, being united with Christ (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), all appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, are to consider ourselves as having nothing whatever to do with sin, living solely for and in the service of the true God (11).

B. *Hence the Justified no more Serve Sin: Verses 12-23.*

If we Christians by baptism have with Christ died unto sin, it necessarily follows that, although whilst we live in this mortal body we cannot altogether be free from sin, yet sin must not rule over us so that we obey the sinful desires that cling to every natural descendant of Adam until death and manifest themselves in and through the body (12). Sin evidently would have such a rule over us if we were in the habit of placing (*παριστάνεται*, Imper. of the Present) our members in its service as weapons to act and fight against the good and righteous will of God. Hence, we are not to do that, but at once and forever to place (*παραστήσομε*, Imper. of the Aorist) our whole person into the service of the true God, as it becomes those that are (*ώνει*) no more dead in sin but living a new life with Christ; and then we shall also place our members into the service of God to promote His righteous will against all His and our enemies (13). And this we can do, at least make a true beginning, since, if we really are Christians, sin will and can no more be our lord and master; and this because we, as such Christians, are not under the rule of the Law that, indeed, on account of our flesh, can only call forth the sin that is in us (comp. 7, 5 sqq.), but under the rule of grace that gives us all that we need also in this respect (14).

But again (comp. v. 1), it would be a false and pernicious inference to conclude that, if we now are under the

V. 12. "Reign" (*βασιλεύετω*, be king and ruler) is emphatic. The "mortal body" (*θνητῷ* emphatic by position) cannot but be subject to sin; for death and sin go together (comp. v. 23; 5, 12). "Thereof" (*αὐτοῦ*) refers to "body": the sinful lusts make the body their dominion and tool.

V. 13. "Instruments" (better, weapons, *(ὅπλα)* "of unrighteousness", that bring about and further unrighteousness. "Sin" is regarded as a king (v. 12), intent upon extending unrighteousness, the negative of the will and law of God. "Instruments" (weapons) "of righteousness", the very opposite of the "instruments of unrighteousness."

V. 14. "Sin", emphatic; we have a different master (*χυρεύσει* = *ἐσται χύριος*).

dominion of grace, which takes away and forgives sin, and not under that of a law which forbids sin, we may commit a sin whenever we feel like it (15). For every one knows that a man cannot but be the obedient servant of him to whom he is in the habit of offering himself as such an obedient servant, whether, indeed, this master be sin, which necessarily leads to death, or obedience to God and His will, which results in righteousness (16). But we, together with the Roman Christians, ought to be thankful to God that our servitude to sin is a thing of the past, and that with a willing heart we have become obedient to that Gospel type of doctrine preached by Paul and his faithful collaborators and successors that by the grace of God we have been led to embrace (17); and that thus our allegiance and obedience has been changed from sin to righteousness (18). For man, as a finite being, owes and yields allegiance and obedience to some one: he is not, and cannot be, sovereign and independent of all authority and lordship, but must be the submissive servant, the very slave, of some one, either of God and righteousness, or of Satan and sin. So strongly the Apostle expresses himself, taking a figure from the relations of human life, viz., bondage or slavery, in order to impress an all-important truth upon his readers who, like all Christians, because of their sinful and weak flesh, are very apt to overlook and forget it. For, viewed from another, equally correct and important, side, what Paul calls servitude and bondage of righteousness, is true liberty itself.

V. 15. *Ἀμαρτήσωμεν*, Aorist, of single sinful acts; ὅποι νόμοι
· ὅποι χάριν: the rule of a law or of grace extends over us
(ὅποι c. acc.).

V. 16. *Παριστάνετε*, Present, denoting a habit; ἡτοι emphasizes the contrast. *Ὑπακοή*, as *ἀμαρτία*, is personified.

V. 17. *Ητε* is emphatic: it is no longer the case; *ὑπηκούσατε*, the ingressive or inceptive Aorist: you have become obedient, have entered the state of obedience. *Εἰς δν παρεδόθητε τύποι*, by assimilation and attraction for *τῷ τύπῳ εἰς δν παρεδόθητε*. “Unto which you have been delivered”, instead of “which has been delivered unto you”, to emphasize what has been done with them without any exertion or merit on their part; they were passive, not active, in getting the Gospel preached to them in its purity. “Type of doctrine”: there were, as there are now, different types or forms, e. g. heathen and Christian, legalistic, or Judaistic, and evangelic, or Pauline.

V. 18. *Τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*, dative of relation: unto righteousness.

What the Apostle means is, that just as in our former, unregenerate, state we willingly made our members submissive servants of sin, this moral defilement of ourselves and transgression of the Law of our God, so as to bring about this transgression in fact: so now as Christians we should willingly make our members submissive servants of righteousness, so as to bring about a holy life (19). In our former state we were submissive servants of sin, and thereby were free and independent in one respect; but what a liberty and independence that was: freedom and independence from righteousness and all its blessed consequences (20)! And what the natural result? Things and conditions of which now we are rightly ashamed, since their final outcome is nothing but death, spiritual, natural, and eternal (21). But now, having by the grace and operation of God had our condition entirely reversed, so that our allegiance and obedience is transferred from sin to God, the result is a holy life already here on earth and the final outcome eternal life and happiness in the world to come (22). For death in all its forms and stages is the natural consequence and reward of sin, just what it merits and deserves; but eternal life and happiness is the free and unmerited gift of God for all those

V. 19. *Ανθρώπινον λέγω*: I speak (something) human, use an expression taken from human life. *Διδύλια*: as also sometimes, in classical Greek *διδύλος* is here used as an adjective of three endings: slavish, servile, subject. *Ἀκαθαρτία* (sin with regard to ourselves) and *ἀνομία* (sin with regard to God) the personified principle; the second *ἀνομία* the concrete reality. *Ἄγιασμός* sanctification as a state and condition.

V. 20. *Τῇ διατασίνῃ*, dative of relation: with regard to righteousness (comp. ver. 18).

V. 21. The question is where the point of interrogation is to be put, whether after *τότε*, or after *ἐπιστήνεσθε*. In the former case the translation would be: "What fruit, therefore, had you then? (Those things, *τῶα*) on account of which you now are ashamed"; in the latter: "What fruit, therefore, had you then (of those things, *τούτων*) on account of which you now are ashamed?" And in this latter case the implied answer of the rhetorical question would be: None, fruit then being taken in the good sense only. The former punctuation is to be preferred as most natural.

V. 22. *Τῷ θεῷ*, dative of relation (comp. ver. 18). *Τὸν κάρπων δημάν*: that fruit or result that is peculiar to, and distinctive of, men that are in such a state and condition, viz. submissive servants of God, delivered from the servitude of sin.

that by faith receive the promised Messiah in the person of Jesus as their Redeemer and Savior (23).

CHAPTER VII.

A. *With Christ the Justified have Died unto the Law that Proved only an Occasion for Sinning to them: Vv. 1-13.*

In the preceding chapter, v. 14, the Apostle had stated that a justified man is no more under a law, but under grace. In the following verses he had then met a false and dangerous conclusion that might be drawn from that statement. Now he proceeds to prove this statement to such as might not be willing to admit its correctness. They all, his brethren in the faith (1, 13), are well acquainted with the law

V. 23. *Οὐφάντια* a soldier's pay or wages (comp. Luke 3. 14; 1 Cor. 9, 7); a sinner by his (actual) sin serves sin (as a ruling and domineering principle) just as a soldier serves his master, and accordingly gets from sin a soldier's pay. *Ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ:* in Him this life is found, as He obtained it for mankind; and whoever is in Him, or in communion with Him, by faith, receives and enjoys it.

V. 5. *Flesh* (*σάρξ*) is the designation of man that distinguishes him from all other rational beings, God and the angels, he being the only one that has flesh, or a body (comp. 6, 6). Hence it could be used of him even if he had not fallen, as we see, *e. g.*, from John 1, 14 where it is said that the Word became flesh, and where as a matter of course the idea of anything sinful must be excluded. But since after the fall man as the natural descendant of Adam and Eve exists only as a sinful, weak, and mortal being, and this also becomes manifest in and through the visible part of his nature, the body as the organism of flesh, the word flesh as a rule designates him as such a sinful, weak, and mortal creature. This is especially the case when with man flesh is opposed to spirit, the latter then denoting the new principle of life that in regeneration has been implanted in him by the Holy Spirit; whilst flesh denotes his old, connate sinful nature that rules and governs him before regeneration and even until death clings to him and retards him after by regeneration the new principle has been introduced as the ruler and governor of his life.

V 14. *Spiritual:* comp. v. 5. *Carnal:* the word used here in the original (*σάρκινος*) is stronger than the usual one (*σαρκικός*) the former denoting the *material*, the latter simply the *quality*: according to his inbred nature he is flesh, has not simply somehow acquired the quality of flesh.

and its principles, whether, as former Jews, it be that of the people of Israel or, as former Gentiles, that of the law-renowned Romans; hence he can appeal to their own legal knowledge. It tells them that the Law can be binding on a man only as long as he lives (1). This is shown by the case of a married woman that by law is bound to her husband only as long as death does not intervene (2), so that she can be considered an adulteress only if she marries another man whilst her first husband is still among the living (3). This proves that death changes the relation and does away with the obligation imposed by the Law. As already shown in the preceding chapter, the death of Christ is at the same time also the death of that man that by faith is united to Christ as his Substitute and Savior. But this death of Christ was also a death unto the Law to which Christ had subjected Himself in our place and for our benefit, fulfilling it for us by His life and atoning for our transgressions of it by His death; and thus after His death He is no more under the Law: He has done with it as He has done with sin. Hence those that have died with Him, also have died unto the Law when Christ's body hung on the cross; and this has the effect that they are no more under the Law, that it is no more to them the, impossible, way to salvation, but that now they have become the subjects of an entirely different Lord and Master, who is able to save them, as He has proved by His resurrection (1, 4). And only in this way can they live a life that really is what it should be, a life in the service and to the honor of God (4). Such a life was not possible in their former condition when their flesh, their

V. 1. *Nόμον*, without the article, law in general: *δ* νόμος, with the article, the law applying here, the divine or Mosaic.

V. 2. *Tῷ ζῶντι* has the emphasis; *δέδεται*, Perfect: is in the state and condition of one bound; *δ* νόμος τῷ ἀνδρός: the law binding her to the husband.

V. 3. *'Εαν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ξετρώ: if she have become (a wife) unto another man.*

V. 4. *Ωστε: The inference to be drawn from vv. 2 and 3 is the general rule stated above, viz., death changes the relation and does away with the obligation imposed by the Law. It makes, therefore, no difference which one of the two parties concerned has died. Hence the Apostle can, in his application of that general rule, say that we have died, and not the Law, and hence are free from the Law, whilst in vv. 2 and 3 the woman, who had not died, is said to have become free from the law binding her to her husband, namely, by the death of the latter.*

connate sinful nature, ruled them; for then the natural passions that manifest themselves in a multitude of sins, and that were simply aroused by the Law, were active in their members so that whatever they did was sinful and hence could only lead to death, the wages of sin (5; comp. 6, 23). But now, having died with Christ, we have also died to the Law in which we were held as in a prison; and thus we now can serve God in the new life wrought by His Spirit, instead of serving sin in the old life under the Law that, being simply an external commandment, could not change our heart and give us new life (6; comp. 2 Cor. 3, 6).

From what has been said above some one might think himself justified in drawing the conclusion (comp. 6, 1) that the Law itself must be sin, or immoral in its very nature; but this, again, would be an unwarranted inference (comp. 6, 2). How can the Law, the expression of the will of a holy and righteous God, be sin? Hence, that cannot be what the Apostle means. What he intends to say is rather (*ἀλλά*), that the Law is the means, and the necessary means, for fallen man of coming to a true knowledge of his sinful state and condition (comp. 3, 20). That was Paul's experience, and that is the experience of every Christian. No man understands his own sinful nature who does not know coveting or lust, that is, who does not know that already the imaginations, the thoughts and desires, of the natural man are evil, sinful from his youth (Gen. 8, 21). But this St. Paul, as every man, would not have known if the Law had not taught him that to covet is forbidden (7). By this commandment sin, which since the fall dwells in the heart of every man, was aroused, and just because it is forbidden, excited every kind of lust in his heart, whilst before this sin in a manner

V. 5. *In the flesh*: in its sphere and dominion; *τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου*, scil. *δύτα*: they that were, or existed, through the Law, were called into activity by it. *Members*: comp. 6, 13.

V. 6. *Ἀποθανότες ἐν ὁ κατεχόμενα*: having died unto that (*τούτῳ* to be supplied before *ἐν ὁ*) in which we were being firmly held (Imperf. of *κατέχω*), namely, the Law. Others understand our sinful condition, as the Law has already been mentioned in the first clause and understanding it here would involve a tautology; but the second clause adds the new idea of the Law as a prison (comp. Gal. 3, 23). *Ωστε δουλεῖνεν*: so that we can and shall serve (*ώστε* c. inf.).

V. 7. *Τέ γάρ*: for also, for indeed (*τέ* simply adds something intimately connected with what precedes, *γάρ* states that it is the reason of the latter).

had lain dormant and inactive (8). He knows, namely, of a time, the time of his childhood, when he was unconscious of the Law; but when the commandment not to covet (v. 8) came to his consciousness, sin unmistakably manifested its presence and life (9). In consequence he fell deeper and deeper into spiritual death and condemnation; and thus the commandment (v. 8) and the whole Law that, in itself, according to the will of God, is the way to life, revealing, as it does, the will of God as the indispensable norm of a true and happy life, proved itself to be the way to death for him (10). For sin, being aroused by the commandment, deceived him, as it did our first parents and still does every man, misusing and perverting the commandment into an occasion for sinning and pretending to be the way to happiness; and thus the commandment became an instrument and means of death (11). Thus it becomes manifest that the Law in itself is not sinful (comp. v. 7), and that, on the contrary, the commandment (v. 8), as every part of the Law, is in perfect conformity with the holiness and righteousness of God and the true happiness of man (12). Hence Law and sin are not identical. But are perhaps Law and death, so that what is good and beneficial in itself, has at the same time by its own nature become the cause of the greatest evil to the individual sinner? That would be a preposterous conclusion (comp. 6, 2). Strictly and accurately speaking, not the Law is the cause of the sinner's death, but sin abusing the Law and perverting what in itself is good into the cause of the greatest evil; which, in the providence of God, must serve to let sin manifest itself in its worst form (13).

V. 8. *Διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς*, expressing the means, is best connected with *χατηργήσατο* (comp. v. 11. 18); with *ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα* a similar idea must be supplied.

V. 9. *Ἐγὼ δέ* over against sin (comp. v. 10); *ζῶν*, Imperf., denoting duration and condition: I was living, whilst sin was dead.

V. 10. *Εδρέθη μοι*: was found with regard to me. After *εἰς* *ζών* and *εἰς θάνατον* the participle *ωντα* can be supplied: the first expression denoting the original purpose, the second the actual result.

V. 12. *Holy*: the opposite of sin; *just*: in accordance with what ought to be; *good*: beneficial.

V. 13. *Θάνατος*: death, by way of metonymy = cause of death. But sin (has become death, i. e. the cause of death unto me), in order that it might appear as sin by working through that which is good death unto me, in order that sin might become exceedingly sinful.

B. Not the Law, however, but the Flesh is the Real Cause of Sin (Vv. 14-25).

Hitherto the Apostle has been speaking of what with him now is a thing of the *past* (vv. 7-13). Now he speaks of his *present* state and condition. What he says, therefore, applies to every Christian, to every one that is of his present state and condition. But it also applies to only such a one; for what the Apostle here predicates of himself as to his relation and attitude towards the Law and towards all that is good (e. g. vv. 15, 17, 19 sq. 22), cannot be predicated of any natural, unregenerated man, but only of a man that by regeneration has received a new principle of life, is no more merely flesh, but is governed by the Spirit and hence is spirit himself, though the flesh still clings to him and weakens and hinders him. The reason that the Apostle here so strongly emphasizes the latter fact is that he means to set forth the important idea that the insufficiency and inability of the Law to serve man is simply caused by the flesh, which even in a regenerated man manifests its hostility towards the Law and prevents its perfect fulfilment. The other side, the spiritual nature of a Christian, is not even overlooked here, as the verses mentioned above show, and is fully brought out in the next section (8, 1 sqq.). Inspiration does not do away with the common rules of human speech and rhetoric, since what is given by inspiration is meant for men. And **one of those common rules** is, that if you want to emphasize one of two sides, you must sometimes express yourself as if only that side existed, without, however, denying the existence of the other side. This rule is followed here, as it so often in Holy Writ.

The Apostle, as every Christian, knows that the Law in its origin and nature is divine and hence spiritual, has nothing in common with sin or death, and cannot, strictly speaking, be called the cause of them. This cause is, rather, man himself, and this because since the fall he by nature is flesh and nothing but flesh, a bond-servant and slave of sin, and this nature clings to him even after he has become a new

through the commandment, which commandment aroused sin and thus made it manifest. The two final clauses introduced by *ινα* are co-ordinate, the repetition in a somewhat fuller form emphasizing the idea. Hence it seems preferable to connect the clause "by working through that which is good death unto me" with the immediately preceding words "in order that it might appear as sin", and not, as some do, with those preceding these, viz. "but sin (has become death unto me)".

man by regeneration, until by a death in Christ he is totally delivered from sin and all its consequences (14). What a Christian still does in transgression of the Law, is something foreign to his regenerated inner self, according to which he does not want to do it, but rather hates it; but still he cannot on account of his flesh altogether avoid transgressing the Law every day and hour of his life (15). But by doing what his real self does not want to do he also actually admits that the Law is good and proper (*χαλός*), and ought to be observed in all its requirements (16). Hence now, as a Christian, he does no more, as in his former, unregenerated state, commit the transgression of the Law himself, with the concurrence of his real self, but sin that still dwells in him does this (17). This is proved by his experience that tells him that in him, in so far as his flesh still clings to him, there dwells nothing good. According to his regenerated self he is always ready and willing to do what is good; but because of his flesh the actual doing (*κατεργάζεσθαι*, comp. v. 15) of what is good and proper is not a matter of course, is not always easy nor possible (18). For there is in him a continual conflict between the will of his regenerated self

V. 15. *Κατεργάζεσθαι*: accomplish, perform; *πράσσω*: practice; *ποιῶ*: do, bring about — all three expressions designating the same idea in its different aspects and bearings. “Know” (*γνῶσσω*) is by some here taken in the same sense as Matt. 7, 23 and John 10, 14: know as my own, recognize as such; and this makes good sense. We think, however, that the usual signification will do here: I do not understand what I perform, am in my doing an inexplicable mystery to myself, in so far as in it the very opposite of what I will manifests itself (Weiss). *Τοῦτο* is emphatic in both cases: that and nothing else.

V. 17. *Νῦν ὁ δέ*, by most expositors understood temporally (comp. 3, 21), in opposition to what formerly was the case: but now; others take it as the classical authors use *νῦν*, in the logical sense = under these circumstances; whilst others combine the temporal and the logical sense, the latter following from the former, which seems preferable.

V. 18. “Flesh”, comp. v. 5. The distinction that the Apostle here makes between himself (*ἐγώ εἰμι*) and his flesh (*ἐγώ τοῦ σαρκὸς μου*) by pointing out that these two are not identical but that the latter is only a part or side of the former, also proves that he here speaks of himself in his regenerated state; for only a regenerated person can distinguish between himself, ruled by the spirit, and his flesh, whilst an unregenerate person is nothing but flesh. *Ηαράτεται μη-* lies beside me, is ready for me, can be used and employed without

and the indwelling sin (19 sq.). So then the fact that sin is still dwelling in his nature is to him, though according to his regenerated self he wants to do what is good, a kind of a law that binds him and that he cannot shake off in this life (21). According to his inner regenerated self the Law of God is altogether his joy, and to live in accordance with it is his greatest pleasure (22); but in his members there becomes manifest to him a wholly different law that governs their actions and is in constant conflict with the Law of God

difficulty; θέλειν (not βούλειν) includes the determination: a regenerate man is determined to do what is right and good, has not merely a languid wish, and still his flesh so often thwarts him. After τὸ θέλειν must be supplied τὸ καλόν: that which is as it ought to be, answering its divine purpose, and therefore praiseworthy and commendable.

V. 19. *"Ο θέλω πνιῶ ἀγαθὸν = τὸ ἀγαθὸν ο θέλω πνιῶ:* the relative clause being put before the word to which it refers throws out the article of the latter; the same is the case with οὐδὲ θέλω κακόν. *Toῦτο* again emphatic: this, and not the good (comp. v. 15).

V. 20. Comp. vv. 16, 17. This important truth is stated again to lead over to the conclusion in the next verse.

V. 21. *Tὸν νόμον* can grammatically be the accusative of relation = with regard to the (divine) Law I find, etc.; but it is certainly more natural to regard the two words as the object of εὑρίσκω. Then, of course, they cannot mean the divine Law given through Moses, but must rather denote a law or norm in general, viz. an ever-recurring fact that, because it cannot be prevented or avoided, binds and compels like a law (comp. v. 23; — as also with regard to a wider signification of νόμος 3, 27; 8, 2). *Tῷ θέλοντι — καλόν* is most naturally construed with εὑρίσκω κτλ.: "I consequently find the law for me who am determined to do that which is good"; the dative is that of relation. Others regard it as belonging to παράκειται, being for the sake of emphasis placed before οὐτι and then after this conjunction repeated by ἐμοί: "that to me who am determined to do that which is good to me that which is evil is present." Both ἐμοί are emphatic, accentuating the identity of the person concerning whom such contrary statements are made.

V. 22. *Συνήδημας* either means: "I rejoice together with", or: "I rejoice altogether (σὺν being emphatic = altogether, completely). If the former, and usual, signification is assumed, τῷ νόμῳ is dependent on σὺν: "I rejoice together with the Law", and this Law is personified = I entirely

that now, after his regeneration, is enthroned and governs in his mind, and thus deprives him of the liberty to act in accordance with the will of his inner self (23). This bondage under the law and rule of sin that every Christian here on earth must suffer, is so repugnant and tormenting to him that with the Apostle he has no dearer wish than to be delivered from the body wherein this terrible corruption, sin and in consequence death, has its abode (24). But all the agony and misery that his sinful flesh causes a Christian cannot drive him to despair; for he at the same time knows, and thanks God for this knowledge, that God Himself through Jesus Christ is his Savior, who already has done so much for him and also finally will complete His work of redemption, delivering him from the last vestiges of sin.

agree with the Law; if the latter, the dative is dependent on the verb itself. In both cases the expression is so strong that we cannot understand how any one can maintain that the Apostle here speaks of himself in his former unregenerate condition. *The inward*, or inner, *man* is the innermost part of man, the invisible ruling principle within him, the real self, the personality, which in a Christian is regenerated, is directed God-ward, as before regeneration it was the seat of sin and godlessness; in the next verse it is called *νοῦς*, mind, the organ of moral and religious perception and knowledge.

V. 23. "*Ἐτερον νόμον*: a law of an entirely different character (comp. *ἔτερον* 2, 1), not *ἄλλον*: another one of the same kind. This "different law" is sin as the principle ruling the flesh or the old man. The *members*, viz. of the body, are the instruments used by sin (comp 6, 18; 7, 5). *The law of the mind*: that which rules the mind, the real self of a Christian = the Law of God inscribed upon his heart (comp. v. 25). *The law of sin* = the *different law*, as is apparent from the words added to both: "in my members". The former expression is used in reference to the latter, instead of a pronoun (*ξαυτῷ*), in order to define it the more exactly and emphasize its nature. *Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κτλ.*: the law of sin = sin as a ruling principle is, so to say, the prison in which the captive is held so that he cannot act as he would like to do.

V. 24. *Τοῦτον* can be construed either with *σώματις* or with *θανάτου*; the position is in favor of the latter construction, whilst both constructions give us a sense that fits into the context: "this body of death" as well as "the body of this death" is of course the body in which, as described in the preceding verses, spiritual death, sin, and hence also natural death as its consequence, dwells and manifests itself. Under these circumstances the most natural construction should be followed.

But as far as the Christian himself in his life here upon earth is concerned, the twofold condition remains: with his regenerated inner self he is an obedient servant of the Law of God, but as to his flesh he also still is a bond-servant under the law and power of sin (25).

V. 25. *Διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χ.:* Christ is the mediator of Paul's praise because He is the mediator of his deliverance from sin and its wages; through Him Paul has been delivered, and through Him therefore he praises God (*διά* c. gen.). Christ is called our "Lord" in the sense of the Second Article, having made us His own by His redemptive work. *Ἄμμι οὐδὲ:* a final summary of vv. 14-25b; *αὐτὸς ἐγώ:* I myself, the very, identical person of whom I hitherto have spoken. *Τῷ νοῖ* (later form of the dative, as *νοός* of the genitive, according to the 3d declension) *κατ.*: comp. v. 23.

ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CULTUS.

If the sacramental and the sacrificial in the cultus are viewed toward one another as they stand, the last only arising out of the first but the first necessarily producing the second from itself, there must be a mediation of the one from the other. The Word of God must be expounded in the sermon and the sacrament must be communicated and received, that the gifts, whose bearers they are, may be appropriated by the congregation. In these mediating efficacies of the sermon and the administration of the sacraments the office of preaching has its duty. Since according to the Lutheran view the preacher is in the congregation and yet in another sense not at all in the congregation, preaching and the administration of the sacraments stand in the midst between the sacramental and the sacrificial, and have part in both. The Word of God in itself and the sacraments in themselves are purely of a sacramental nature, but when the church takes the first upon her lips and preaches thankfully the Word of salvation given her by divine grace, to her own children and to the world, she is "ministering the gospel" of God. Rom. 15, 16. And when the church takes the divinely offered gifts of the altar and nourishes herself thankfully from them such act is Eucharist, thanksgiving, therefore a sacrificial act. Preaching is sacramental so far as it is the objective declaration of

the Word of God, but all elements of subjective appropriation, which preaching necessarily is, as petition, thanksgiving, comfort, repentance, admonition, etc., are of a sacrificial nature. This character of mediation also other portions of the cultus in part bear, e. g. the singing of the congregation, because it is partially a sermon directed to itself by the congregation, as will be shown later. But what in general pertains to this mediating efficacy in the divine service, Melanchthon has pointed out very clearly in the above cited passage from the Apology, both in the passage and in its nature; and it is emphatically the Protestant Church which has brought this forth in its proper relation over against the Romish Church which omitted it. So firmly does the Lutheran Church stand thereupon, that God's Word is not wanting in any service of the Church, yea so decidedly does she demand it, that the expounding of the Word always accompanies its reading. After the reading of the lection in the early divine service "the preacher or whoever is authorized, shall step forth and expound a portion of the same lection, that all the others may understand and learn it, and be admonished. And where this does not take place the congregation is not bettered by the lection; as it formerly occurred in cloisters and monasteries, where they only read to the walls." Luth. Walch. x. 264. Here indeed the fundamental rule holds: *interpret Scripture by Scripture*, but always that one, where the gift of preaching is absent, can read self-interpreting passages also without the accompanying exposition. At the same time the most careful liturgies make provision for these cases also, that at least short summaries to the lections are read, or they set apart for these Bible lections special lectionaries, which contain a paraphrase of the portions read and thus give an exposition of them. In regard to the Lord's Supper the Protestant Church holds that it is never to be celebrated without a receiving congregation, in opposition to the private mass of the Romanists. The Wolfenbüttler KO. says p. 37: "Where there are no communicants present the pastor shall not celebrate the sacrament, that the Church be not again thrown into the idolatry of the papistic indulgences."

With such dogmatic clearness, created out of the depth of the Gospel, concerning the essence and the elements of Christian worship the Lutheran Church stands in conscious freedom over against the historical traditions. To abolish, to reject, to deny is often a product of weakness

rather than a sign of power. The Lutheran Church has a rule through this dogmatical clearness by which she can certainly ascertain what is allowable and not allowable in the transmitted cultus; she does not need, as the Reformed Church, in order not to err, to cast herself upon the still insufficient rule of the abstracted biblical and antiquarian principles; she can go safely and surely to the transmitted forms of divine service, prove all and hold the good, complete the half good, set right the crooked, and reject the false. We shall see later how the mediaeval worship contains many separate elements from the pure ancient church, only covered up, mutilated and changed in their meaning. When the Lutheran Church received these elements in a purified state she preserved a connection with the ancient Church and with the whole Church, which the Reformed Church stormily rent asunder. The Lutheran Church was in some measure necessitated to a conservative procedure. The origin of the Reformed Church was in small aroused circles and village communities; such smaller, narrower, and in this formation more easily moved circles, exercised decidedly their constitutive power; and this circumstance gave essential direction to all their institutions. The Lutheran Church had from the beginning whole kingdoms and masses of people to control. Upon this ground it was necessary for her to bring about her reformation not through unnecessary break with what existed, but, so far as the truth permitted, by way of transition. Thus she revised, purified and preserved the established.

But one would go much astray, were he to believe that the whole liturgical activity of the Lutheran Church consisted in such purified revision of the Romish worship, as if only these borrowed fragments were put together in a poor way, or only a few new pieces sewed onto the old Romish garment. A short retrospect will show the necessity of the opposite. The Romish Church had sought to bring the sacramental part of the cultus down to a sacrificial signification and to elevate her sacrificial undertakings to a sacramental honor, and thus corrupted both elements of divine worship and abolished or weakened the mediating efficacy. When therefore the Lutheran Church apprehended and received these three elements in their distinction, it required a new arrangement of the service, which would bring each element in a right relation to the other, in which in relation to the Romish cultus entirely new liturgical

proceedings took place, and even gave to each received individual part another relation to the whole and thereby another sense. The Lutheran service, therefore, in spite of its partly conservative relation, over against the mediaeval is new.

This newness arises, apart from the one, e. g., from the general introduction of the sermon which appeared only sporadically in Catholicism, especially in one point kept entirely in the background in the Romish cultus: in the participation of the congregation in the divine service. The gifts of God in worship, Word and sacrament are communicated to the congregation through the sermon and the distribution. . Already this hearing and receiving participation of the congregation, necessitates an active sharing of it, since many only remain receptive where they are also active; and the congregation must also preach to itself in hymns that it may with blessing be preached to. Moreover the whole sacrificial side of worship is according to its conception an act of the congregation; and a sinking down to the standpoint of the Romish "for them all" to a special degree could not be avoided, if this part of the worship of the congregation were not carried to a full or reciprocal execution. It is according to the true meaning, when the congregation itself offers this sacrifice to the Lord. How the Lutheran liturgy accomplishes this participation of the congregation in the hymns and responses, the following will show. Here two results are to be mentioned which arise from necessity out of this. First the use of the German language in the worship. From the beginning of the Lutheran Church the Word of God was read and preached and the sacraments administered in the German language. How the German language must first make a way into the other parts of the liturgy, and through what special labors and in what historical way this was realized, the result must teach. The second consequence was, that the worship, which was there only for the congregation, was every time a unit, embraced and comprehended the entire congregation; that the multiplication of divine services in Catholicism, whereby at the same time in the same church (see above) several masses without reciprocal consistency could be read, must be done away. "This (hold worship, read and sing) will we do harmoniously, if God permit, and not suffer in our churches such discordant and inept proceedings, as has been so long the case, where one sang a mass of the festival, another one of Mary, the third a requiem, etc., and howl

together, as wolves, for the sake of money." Braunschweig K.O., 1528.

The totality of all these principles concerning the essence and regulation of the divine worship leads necessarily to a fixed liturgy. The sharper, according to the above, the Lutheran Church divided the elements of the worship, and the more she in every mixture and mistake of these differences discovered the danger of radical error, the less was she inclined to leave to accident or to the choice of the individual congregation or to the individual preacher, the composition of all these elements into the concrete form of the congregational service, in which composition it is easiest that a confusion of the elements might appear. Certainly the participation of the congregation in the worship, though new, was a point, whose circumspect arrangement was as necessary as it was difficult. A little Reformed community, after some general arrangements, could leave the remainder to custom and momentary agreement; for the great Lutheran territory fixed orders of worship were required. Also the preponderating interest which the Lutheran Church attributes to the instruction and care of the congregation demands, from a pedagogical regard, a fixed abiding order in the worship that the congregation may feel at home in it, and always find its way back to what is known. "The purpose is to teach and lead the people; therefore it is necessary, that one here gives up freedom and leads in the one way,—especially in the same church. I wish that in prayer one use the same paraphrase and exhortation (spoken of the Lord's Prayer in liturgy) or the same order in words and letters, for the sake of the people; that to-day one form, to-morrow another is not used, each one striving to show his art, and thus misleading the people, so that they cannot learn or retain anything." Luther, Deutsche Messe, X 283. Therefore the great attention which all Lutheran K.O.O. give to the careful construction of the divine services, and the circumstance that a circle of leaders, next to Luther, Bugenhagen, Brenz, Corvinus, Veit Dietrich, distinguished themselves in their labors for the services of the sanctuary and the cultus. To be sure, the K.O.O. proceeded in the fixing of the form of the services with greater circumspection; they never neglected to prefix a warning that they did not mean in such orders to prescribe what was necessary for all circumstances, unchangeable and es-

sential to salvation; but with one voice they teach, with express modesty over against the Word and sacraments, the free and rhetorical nature as well as the human churchly and common origin of the ceremonies, in contradistinction to the Romish regard of the missal. "But the ceremonies," continues the Chur. KO. after the above cited passage, "are external rites, outward works in the common assembly of the Christian Church, arranged according to the need or occasion of persons and places by virtue of our Christian liberty by godly pious Christians, unanimously received, graciously granted, and commonly accepted, that everthing may go on orderly and to the edification in the Christian congregation and are therefore adiaphora, entirely unnecessary to salvation, can and may in special cases of pressing need and Christian love be omitted, or where they do not serve the Church for edification, and, as alas, it more frequently happens, where they have fallen into idolatrous abuse and cannot be changed, they should be abolished." Similar though seldom so radical positions all the KOO. take. At the same time we would err seriously if we took this expression, ceremonies are adiaphora, as if it were all one to the Lutheran Church, whether in the worship the form was thus or otherwise. To the contrary already speaks the weight which she lays upon her ceremonies not only over against the Romish but also, the Reformed Church, so also the strong opposition met by the attempted introduction of church orders not "pure" according to Lutheran conception, as e. g. the Prussian of 1558. The conception of the adiaphoron is rather according to the Formula of Concord to be placed in opposition to the Romish view of the expiating and justifying power of their ceremonies. He also would greatly err who thinks that the Lutheran Church lays great weight upon the likes or dislikes or the passion for innovation of a congregation or a pastor. Rather history teaches fully what little regard she showed in practice such unyielding individuals, from Carlstadt on; and theoretically, grounded upon 1 Cor. 14, 33, she has always looked upon and treated the right of liturgical regulation and change as a right of the Church, considered the local congregation and the inividual pastor bound to the regulations of the whole Church, confined to the unanimity of the ceremonies, forbidden all arbitrary innovation and well knew the great practical danger of liturgical inconsiderateness and alteration. To such ceremonies, that God's Word may be the better

learned, the sacraments devoutly used, and the Christian Church may be better and easier extended, before all things is necessary the unanimity and common agreement of the ceremonies. Therefore one must in the highest degree beware of the troublesome and dangerous burden of innovations, without necessity and the most excellent reasons to change, renew, shorten, increase or lessen the ceremonies of the Church, or lightly to turn from old, beautiful, useful common customs and known inoffensive forms to other newly found and imported ceremonies and church services. Accordingly it is beautiful and advantageous to the young Christian to have the ceremonies alike throughout the whole land, and with the common people a great assistance and encouragement. For when the poor people, who are not alone weak but for the most part uninstructed, see in one place a different form of service and use of ceremonies than in another, they do not know how it stands with their whole religion, and cannot adapt themselves to the forms without offense. Therefore we will supply a Christian service in the Churches of this principality and not be tempted by Calvinistic fanaticism, which from hardened blindness does not know that God is not a God of confusion and dissension, but of peace. 1 Cor. 14, 33." Thus it came that the Lutheran orders of service are nearly uniform, not only in each Lutheran principality, but — with the deduction of the exceptions given below — in all Lutheran Germany. The liturgical deviations of the German Lutheran principalities are not greater between themselves than the differences allowed within the individual principality. The following will give how the Lutheran Church more closely unites freedom and liturgical order.

The Reformed Church was a unit with the Lutheran Church in her opposition to the Romish Church and her views of the mass, and the meritoriousness of her ceremonies, etc, as also in many cases of practice, e. g. the use of the German language. But apart from the diverging application which both churches made of the Scripture principle, the Reformed Church differed from the Lutheran in a principal, important point: she did not share the Lutheran view concerning the sacramental in the cultus. Zwingli said: "I believe, yea I know that all sacraments not only do not hold grace, but do not even mediate it. For as grace (given in Latin but I understand by it reconciliation, forgiveness and undeserving bestowal) is wrought or given by the divine Spirit, this gift comes alone to the (human) soul. The

Spirit does not need a bearer or vehicle, for He Himself is the conveying power, through whom all is conveyed, and does not need Himself to be conveyed. We never read in the Holy Scriptures that visible things, which the sacraments are, bear with certainty with them the Spirit; but when visible things are conveyed at the same time with the Spirit, the Spirit and not the visible is the bearer. As, when a strong wind blew, tongues (Acts 2) were carried by the power of the wind; the wind was not borne by the power of the tongues. The wind brought quails and carried away locusts; but quails and locusts are not so light that they could bear the wind. When a wind storm, powerfully disturbing the mountain, passed by Elias, the Lord was not carried by the wind. In short, the wind blows where it listeth, etc. So is every one that is born of the Spirit, that is: he is enlightened and drawn in an invisible and not perceptible manner. That, the Truth has spoken; therefore not through the immersion, not through the participation (in Lord's Supper), not through the anointing, is the grace of the Holy Spirit conveyed. But — the Spirit is already present, before the sacrament, according to His good pleasure and consequently grace works and is present before the sacrament is administered. From this it follows that the sacraments are given for a public testimony of that grace which is there already for each one. Accordingly God's Word and the Sacraments are not *means of grace*, not bearers of the Lord, His Spirit and His gifts; the Spirit does not at all need such means of mediation; moreover the divine service is not a place where the gracious treasures of forgiveness, etc., are imparted to the congregation through the Lord, which rather takes place in an immediate inward process between the divine Spirit and my spirit; but when the Lord is present in the services of His Church, He is not there essentially, but only in so far as His believers bear Him and His Spirit there in their hearts; and when mention is made of the activity of the Lord in the services, it is not so much an efficacious as a receptive presence — that receives the offering of His Church."

Even when the later Reformed Church, through the influence of Calvin and Lutheran leaven receded from Zwingli's sharpness, yet in the Calvinistic conception this stands, that the Lord in the gifts of His altar is present in an effectual manner only in so far as the communicants bear Him there in their hearts by faith. Thus it always returns to the point that the Reformed Church never recognizes anything *sacramental* in the sense of the Lutheran Church; that

the *sacrificial* is decidedly prominent in her, and that she, while the Lutheran Church first of all teaches and feeds the congregation in the divine service, gives her services rather an exciting and arousing character, and looks upon them as places where the believers exhibit and manifest that life wrought in them through the hidden working of the Spirit. But if the Lutheran Church is right in the view that the *sacrificial* grows only out of the sacramental, the Reformed Church in her half estimation of the latter must lose also the full value of the first; by the half estimation of the means of grace in Word and Sacrament she stops the fountain out of which the congregation must ever draw the power for song, praise, petition and thanksgiving; and it is proven by a casual observance of her poverty in church song that she, notwithstanding her preference of the *sacrificial*, has only reached a poor cultivation of it. Rather has it happened that she, only half grasping the sacramental and the *sacrificial*, is limited to the mediating efficacy of the sermon and the celebration of the sacrament in which her whole worship is found, and that she comprises and treats this chiefly on the *sacrificial* side. She looks at the sermon pre-eminently in the view that she therein "offers the gospel of God"; and in the Lord's Supper she holds most lovingly to what the congregation does in it, to the remembrance of Him, to the keeping of the Lord's death, and puts it under the conception of thanksgiving and names it preferably the Eucharist. The result of this view is apparent; out of such a low consideration of the *sacrificial* no right participation of the congregation in the cultus could take place. The participation of the congregation in the Reformed Church has been more in the sphere of government; it was more natural to such agitated bodies to wish to take part in government than to learn. And again in this small participation of the congregations and in the lessening greatness of the Church principally a fixed and perfect liturgy was not so necessary. We therefore find in the Reformed Church the liturgical forms of the Lutheran generally superseded by the free prayer of the preacher, which, in the city awakened congregations of the Reformed, could be more readily counted on instantly to be understood and appreciated. The Reformed Church has never known how to understand or to estimate what the Lutheran Church wishes with her liturgy, as the following passage from the otherwise moderate Second Helvetic Confession, chap. 27, shows: "To the ancient people certain ceremonies as means of education were given, even to them who were under the law

of Moses as under a schoolmaster and tutor; but since Christ the Redeemer came, and abolished the law, we believers are no longer under the law, Rom 6., 14, and the ceremonies, which the apostle would not keep or renew in the Church of Christ, passed away, as they themselves clearly testify that they would not put a yoke upon the Church. Acts 15, 28. We would therefore appear to restore Judaism, if we in the Church of Christ multiplied the ceremonies or rites according to the manner of the ancient Church. We therefore in no way favor the view of those who think that the Church of Christ must be held in bonds through manifold and numerous ceremonies as through a kind of discipline. For if the apostles would not bind upon the Christian people the ceremonies or rites ordained by God, what reasonable man will impose inventions of men? The more ceremonies are increased in the Church, the more Christian freedom is overthrown and Christ and faith in Him are taken away, since the people seek in the ceremonies what they should seek alone through faith in the Son of God, Jesus Christ. Therefore few, moderate simple ceremonies, not deviating from the Word, suffice for pious people." All true only against Catholicism.

In this determination the Reformed Church, so far as it concerns the territory of the German language, succeeded only in Switzerland and adjacent free cities. On the contrary it is known that the Southwest divisions of Germany sought to mediate between the Lutheran and the Swiss. In a dogmatic sense they did not try to make a separate confession, but wavered for a long time between the confession of the Lutherans and that of the Swiss. On the contrary in the practical sphere of liturgics they accomplished a sort of a union. It turned out as with all unions and compromises, there was only a quantitative agreement: the Lutheran churches among them received something less of liturgical forms than the pure Lutheran type contains; and the Reformed among them have something less than the strict Swiss. But in this way a new liturgical type arose, which is characterized, when it is named an abbreviation of the full Lutheran form of worship, and which belongs to Baden, Rheinpfalz, partly to Württemberg, Strassburg, and other cities and small kingdoms. The K.O. Pfalzgraf Ott-heinrich of 1556 may speak for this type. After it assures itself that in doctrine, especially in the article of the Lord's Supper, it wishes to be and remain purely Lutheran, it continues: "What pertains to the order of Distribution in the Supper, since for years many kinds of hymns, passages, sal-

utations, and prayers were used along with the first institution of Christ, and some Christian Churches, wherein the gospel is purely preached, in our times still use them frequently, we also, that from God's grace a common, useful and Christian ritual might be kept for the general good of the Christian community, cheerfully retain the same. Yet inasmuch as, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, at all times two sermons, viz. the usual sermon and then the announcement of the death of Christ, should be held, and the number of aforesaid parts may hinder somewhat, for want of time, the necessary sermons and the chief part of the Supper; we will now shorten some of these parts, that they may aptly suit for other times, and prescribe a proper order, that the Church (the congregation) be not detained with annoyance beyond proper time.

Before we pass on to examine the development of the Lutheran worship in particular in its distinction from this or other types, the Romish, the Reformed and the United, it may be serviceable to call to mind once more the Lutheran fundamental principles through the admirable words of the Pomeranian liturgy: "The Almighty God preserves His Christian Church on earth by the public ministry or ecclesiastical office in the assembly of the congregation through doctrine and the preaching of the gospel, through the dispensation of the blessed sacraments and the administration of the holy divine church offices, through Christian hymns, prayers, ceremonies and the like. Thus the Lord desires to be honored, worshiped, praised and glorified by us men in the assembly of the congregation. Ps. 149, 1 ff.; Ps. 22, 23; Ps. 84, 2 ff. Where the divine Word is preached, sung, read and prayed, there the Lord God is present and active with His holy angels, that we with all angels and the elect of God may praise His holy name. To this end the Son of God works through His Word and godly hymns in the hearts of believers. Matt. 18, 19. 20. Such assemblies of Christian believers in the house of the Lord are blessed, beautiful and glorious, and should be held in great honor, love and esteem. Therein we Christians behold an image of the eternal, glorious assembly of the elect, which shall appear at the last day before the Son of Man, our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore God in the Old Testament in the law of Moses prescribed certain times and ceremonies for His people, which they should observe in their assemblies, and commanded all men in general to keep His holy day, and to appear willingly in the congregation of the holy God. Therefore all Christians should take part joyously in the

ceremonies and hymns of the Church. For although the Christian Church is not founded upon uniform arrangement of the ceremonies but upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles, which is our Lord Jesus Christ, and upon His holy divine Word, yet, since God is not a God of confusion but of peace, and wills that all things in the congregation should serve to unity, there is no doubt that it is a service especially well-pleasing to His eternal, divine majesty, that uniform, spiritual, useful forms in ceremonies, as much as possible, be prescribed and kept, which, besides other manifold blessings which they bring, also serve for the preservation of unity in His doctrine and to the avoidance of many offenses to the common person who looks to the outward ceremonies and judges by them of the doctrine, the sacraments and the whole pastoral office. Therefore approved forms in hymns, lections and ceremonies should be preserved in our churches. And where this has hitherto not been done, the pastors should conform to these forms, not depart from them without special, weighty reasons, but out of pure Christian love cheerfully keep within them that dissension and offense be avoided with the people. — For no one should be permitted to set himself wilfully against these forms or to make changes according to his own pleasure."

THE POINT OF EMPHASIS IN PREACHING CHRIST TO THE UNSAVED.

BY REV. J. SHEATSLEY, DELAWARE, OHIO.

"I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (1 Cor. 2, 2). Such was Paul's fixed purpose when he began his labors among the Corinthians, and indeed such was his purpose in all his missionary labors. He believed that the Gospel of Christ alone is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, whether Jew or Gentile. There are perhaps some things which Paul as the leader in missions did in which we need not imitate him, but in this one thing at least we must carefully follow his footsteps, we must preach Christ and Him crucified only. The world needs a Savior and this Savior is Christ. To offer the unsaved some substitute for Christ would be cruel mockery.

But is the subject of our message sufficiently defined, when we say that we must preach Christ only? It would

seem so, and yet we know that there are many ships sailing under this flag, and in some of them we would hardly care to take passage. The motto is very true, but it lacks distinctiveness which, at the present time especially, makes a Lutheran at least feel a little uneasy. He thinks of the warning of the Savior that false Christs shall arise. The promise to preach Christ only is a very sufficient recommendation for the ministry, at least so far as orthodoxy is concerned, among such as want no distinctive creed, and there seems to be at the present considerable of a drift in this direction. It is a part of liberalism to ask nothing more of the unconverted than that they should receive Christ as their Savior, and consistently nothing more can be asked of the preacher than that he preach Christ. Nor is there any lack of emphasis on this point at the present by about all schools of preachers. Indeed, some who have drifted very considerably from the lines of orthodoxy are often loudest in their calls for a return to Christ as the subject of our message. Such phrases as "back to Christ," "the larger Christ," "not orthodoxy, not creeds, but Christ," and similar ones are very common. They are plausible, catchy, and it is considered uncharitable and unevangelical to look upon them even with the least suspicion. Because they seem to sound right therefore they must be right, is about all the logic that many think it necessary to apply. But at the risk of being charged with a lack of charity or with being a back number in theology, the loyal servant of his Master Christ and the faithful follower of Paul's preaching, must dissect these shibboleths and determine their exact meaning. There may be a way of preaching "Christ only" that He is not preached at all. What is the point then of primary emphasis in our message of Christ to the unsaved?

The question may be answered from the standpoint of dogmatics. Anthropology teaches us that man is sinful and that by his sins he has merited present and eternal punishment. It teaches too that man in his sinful condition is absolutely helpless on account of the weakness of his will, and that if there is no help from without he must of necessity perish. Soteriology now teaches that propitiation is necessary in order that God and man may be reconciled. Man's sins must be atoned for by another in order that they may be forgiven. Whatever else may be necessary this is primarily essential. We must have God reconciled with us on the basis of our forgiveness, before we can conceive of ourselves as standing in any positive blessed relation to Him. It teaches further that Christ has effected this recon-

ciliation by His atoning death and that in Him we have the forgiveness of our sins. It follows then that in bringing Christ to the unsaved we need to show them first of all that in Christ they will find the complete forgiveness of all their sins and full reconciliation with God. Whatever else needs to be pointed out as needful in their renewed life, the fact of the free remission of their sins must constitute the ultimate ground of their hope. Such is the answer of dogmatics to the proposed question.

But the question may be answered also from a purely Biblical standpoint. Not that the answer of dogmatics is not Biblical, but we can lay our dogmatics aside and answer the question direct from the Bible. This method is probably not so easy, but it may for that reason be of more practical help. It will perhaps also be more satisfactory, since at the present time all important questions bearing on religion are wont to be answered direct from the Bible rather than from some system of theology.

There are two methods now that might be used in answering this question from the Bible. Either we could examine individual passages, until we had compared and collated a number sufficient to convince us of the correctness of our answer. Or we can turn primarily to the book of Acts as the account of New Testament missions, and there learn how the apostles preached Christ to the unsaved. This will perhaps be the most satisfactory and the most helpful way of refreshing and strengthening ourselves in this all-important truth.

There are now a number of reasons why the book of Acts is preëminently fitted to give us instruction on this point. First, not only the author, St. Luke, but also the messengers themselves, the apostles, were inspired men, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit they therefore made no mistake in their preaching. Their theme was given by the Holy Ghost as was also the exposition of their theme. Jesus had given them the general commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark 16, 15). Or as Luke gives it, "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts 1, 8). But they need light and power from on high to give this witness just in the proper form, to lay the emphasis on the right points. This power from on high they enjoyed. We make no mistake then when in preaching Christ to the unsaved we expound Him as did the apostles in their missionary labors. In the second place, the work of the apostles as tabulated by

Luke was purely missionary. All the recorded discourses after the day of Pentecost, with the exception of one or two, were spoken to those outside the Church. Peter's sermon to the mixed multitude on Pentecost was the first and Paul's discourse to the Jews assembled in his own house at Rome was the last. They are the beginning and end of a missionary epoch such as the world has not seen since. The two extremes are connected by a chain of missionary events. In this the book of Acts is especially differentiated from the Gospels. Not only did Christ expressly say that He was sent "but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," to which rule He however allowed a few exceptions, but even among Israel His object was not so much to call men into the Church or His kingdom, as to establish it. He laid the foundation, the apostles built upon it; He established the Church, the apostles called men into it. "Upon this rock I will build My Church," "I will make you fishers of men." As a matter of fact therefore at the morn of Pentecost comparatively few had accepted Christ. One hundred and twenty are given as assembled in the "upper room." The highest number mentioned at any time is "above five hundred" (1 Cor. 15, 6), of whom Matthew tells us that "some doubted" (ch. 28, 17). On the other hand, at Peter's first sermon three thousand believed and were added to the Church. It was in this especially that the apostles did greater work than their Master (John 14, 12). They were fishers of men and can tell us how to use the net.

In the third place, the preaching recorded in the Acts was not to a particular race nor class of men, but to all races and all classes. The commission read that they were to begin at Jerusalem, then to proceed to Samaria, then to go to the Gentiles even to the ends of the earth. The beginning was made at Jerusalem on Pentecost. When persecutions began we hear of Philip, followed by Peter and John, in Samaria. Soon Paul the apostle to the Gentiles appears upon the scene, and makes his great missionary tours, until he comes to Rome, the world city, where he has in a sense reached "the uttermost part of the earth." Likewise all classes and conditions of culture and society are reached. Luke in his account does not mention such facts. There are a few exceptions, however, to this rule, for example, he mentions in particular the "chief women" of Thessalonica and the "honorable women" of Berea as also the Areopagite Dionysius. Yet it is reasonable to suppose and from other sources it is known that all classes of people were found throughout the large territory traversed by St.

Paul alone: the semi-barbarians of Cyprus and of Lystra and Derbe, the philosophers of Athens, the merchants of Corinth, the statesmen of Rome; Jews, Greeks and barbarians, learned and unlearned; nobleman, freedman, and slave, all come under the preaching of the apostles. Here then we may learn how to preach Christ to the unsaved.

When we now turn to the teaching of the Acts we find a goodly number of passages where the subject of apostolic preaching is stated in general terms. "They ceased not to teach and preach Jesus the Christ" (ch. 5, 42); "he preached Christ unto them" (ch. 8, 5); "he preached unto him Jesus" (ch. 8, 35); "he preached Christ in the synagogues" (ch. 9, 20); "they spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus" (ch. 11, 20); "he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection" (ch. 17, 15); "he expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus" (ch. 28, 23); "Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus" (ch. 28, 31). In all these passages the general fact is stated that the apostles preached Christ, without stating however the particular doctrine or doctrines, if any, that were emphasized, or received priority. They do therefore not give us the key to the specific content of apostolic preaching. They allow a certain liberty of browsing about, which in the hands of the inspired apostles was perfectly safe, but which is greatly abused by many preachers of the present, whose professed motto is that they preach Christ only. We need therefore to look around for other evidence which will show in unmistakable terms just what the apostles said about Christ.

Beginning with Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost we find that its general character was determined largely by the charge of drunkenness that was brought against those who were filled with the Holy Ghost. This charge must be met, hence Peter shows that their speaking with tongues is the fulfillment of prophecy and that it took place through Christ; "*He* hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (v. 33). Now, in proving his position Peter emphasized especially two facts with respect to Christ, viz., His death and resurrection. This served a twofold purpose: first, it led to a knowledge of sin and especially of the people's own guilt in the death of Christ, "whom ye have crucified" (v. 36); secondly, it set forth Christ as the living Savior, God hath made Him "both Lord and Christ" (v. 36). The intended effect of the sermon, and that brings out the point of emphasis, is plainly seen in Peter's reply

to the penitent cry of the conscience-stricken people. "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (vv. 37, 38). The close connection with "be baptized" of the phrase, "for the remission of sins," shows that forgiveness of sins is the first blessing to be considered as the fruit of baptism. The gift of the Holy Spirit will follow, or, we can even say, will accompany as a matter of course. But Peter wanted to assure the people first of all of the fact that in Christ they will find the forgiveness of their sins whose guilt they now so plainly felt. Accordingly Christ was primarily preached to these three thousand as the atonement for sin. That the people were further instructed and exhorted to save themselves from the surrounding "untoward generation," and that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer," is just what we expect. This is just what the sinner, after he has once truly accepted pardon, will do. The fact too that their love and piety became so strong that they sold their possessions and had "all things common," continued daily in the temple and in breaking bread from house to house, shows the fallacy of reasoning that a religious system in which forgiveness of sins through faith is the fundamental doctrine is not conducive to spiritual life and fervor.

We pass on to Peter's second sermon delivered at the temple and occasioned by the healing of the lame man (ch. 3). Here too the sermon was given its general outline by the occasion calling it forth. Peter must show, first of all, that it was through the name of Christ and through faith in His name that the man was made strong. In doing this the apostle again emphasizes the facts of Christ's death and resurrection (v. 15), and so points out that He whom the people rejected is really the Savior. And when he now comes to speak of the primary blessing which he wants the people to find in this Savior, it is again remission of sins: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, *that your sins may be blotted out*" (v. 19). Whatever other exhortations may follow, Peter wants the people, first of all, to lay hold upon remission of sins as the ethical substratum for divine favor and spiritual life. Christ is thus again preached primarily as the atonement for sin.

The next two discourses of Peter that come under consideration are two defenses before the high priest (chs. 4 and 5). In both cases Peter is careful to state again that

Christ was crucified, but was raised again from the dead (ch. 4, 10; ch. 5, 30). In both cases too the object of His death and resurrection is set forth, in the first case less definitely as to just how the salvation is attained: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (ch. 4, 12). But in the second case it is again definitely stated that He is a Savior "to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins" (ch. 5, 31). Since repentance is a necessary condition for remission, we see that forgiveness of sins is again set in the forefront.

We now come to St. Stephen's powerful discourse. Although it is the longest recorded discourse in the whole book of Acts, we nevertheless find it unfinished on account of the attack of the Jews upon the speaker. Yet from what Stephen did say we may infer with great certainty what more he would have said, if his hearers would have repented as did the people at the preaching of Peter on Pentecost. St. Stephen reviewed the past history of his people primarily to have them see and feel their sinfulness. Their sins culminated in the betrayal and murder of the Just One. Had his hearers now accepted this rebuke, repented and cried, What shall we do to be saved? there can not be the least doubt that Stephen would have replied in substance as Peter did in his first sermon, Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins. Here also then, it is the fact of sin and the need of forgiveness that stands out as the primary purpose of the discourse.

The preaching of Philip the evangelist comes next under review (ch. 8). Two occasions of his labors are spoken of more at length, that in the city of Samaria and the conversion of the eunuch. The terms describing his work on both occasions are however general, so that the specific primary object of his teaching is not readily seen. Of the Samaritans it is said that he "preached Christ unto them" (v. 5), and likewise of the Ethiopian that he "preached unto him Jesus" (v. 35). Yet by comparing Philip's work with the discourses already considered, and by adding from them what is not mentioned here, the same result is secured. In the case of both the Samaritans and of the Ethiopian the first step after repentance and profession of faith was baptism (vv. 12, 36-38). But to what end were they baptized? Clearly primarily for the remission of sins as is evident from Peter's promise on the day of Pentecost (ch. 2, 38), and from his exhortation in the temple (ch. 3, 19), where baptism is indeed not mentioned, but where forgiveness is con-

nected directly with repentance, the necessary condition for baptism. Again then it is forgiveness of sins as the primary gift that was imparted to the new converts, and these in this case were not Jews, but Samaritans and one Gentile.

The next act of evangelization is the miraculous conversion of Saul. Nothing more needs to be considered here than the part performed by Ananias. In Luke's account of the transaction as given in ch. 9, nothing is said of the purpose of baptism, only the fact is mentioned that Saul was baptized. Ananias of course restored Saul's sight first before the act of baptism, and the promise, furthermore, that he should be filled with the Holy Ghost (v. 17), is not to be conceived as realized until after baptism. See Meyer *in loco*. When we now turn to Paul's own account of the event, we find the primary object of baptism expressly stated: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (ch. 22, 16). At the conversion of the great apostle then, it is also remission of sins that is held out as the first great treasure on which he is to lay hold. His fulness of the Holy Ghost evinced itself especially in this that "straightway he preached Christ in the synagogue, that He is the Son of God," and that he "increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ" (ch. 9, 20, 22).

So far our converts have been from among the Jews and the Samaritans, and by way of exception an Ethiopian. We now come where by special divine intervention a more radical step is taken toward the evangelization of the Gentiles. It is the case of Cornelius and his company (ch. 10). The occasion of course again gives color to Peter's discourse. He must show that God has people among all nations who must be gathered into His kingdom. A summary is then given of Christ's work and teaching with which Cornelius was already in a measure familiar (v. 37). But the primary purpose of the meeting and the discourse appears in the last verse, "To Him gave all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins" (v. 43), remission of sins thus again coming to the forefront. It is true and it seems to be peculiar to this case that the Holy Ghost fell upon the hearers before they were baptized, yet this hardly affects the primacy of the forgiveness of sins, for in the first place, the gift of the Spirit here consisted in linguistic charismata (v. 46) which were not of an essentially saving nature, and in the second place, what Peter in his discourse represents as the primary blessing must be acknowledged as such, even

though it is not mentioned first, or even not mentioned at all, among the actual gifts received. Besides, the external gift of the Spirit in advance of baptism seems to have served a special purpose in this case, viz., it was to be taken by Peter as divine evidence that these Gentiles should be baptized. It was a kind of second Pentecost for the special benefit of the Gentile world. Compare v. 47 and ch. 11, 17. It follows then that for Gentiles, who were not under the law, as well as for Jews the primary blessing to be gained in the reception of Christ is the remission of sins.

We pass on now to the work of St. Paul. The first recorded extended discourse of Paul is the one delivered in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia (ch. 13). He was of course speaking to Jews. He reviews briefly the history of his people and summarizes the work of Christ, and then in the application points out the primary blessing of Christ's redemption: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you *the forgiveness of sins*" (v. 38). This already is very explicit, but he does not stop at this, but goes on and here already declares his great doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law: "And by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (v. 39). Here then we have not only forgiveness of sins as the primary blessing of redemption, but this forgiveness is interpreted too as positive righteousness and as a free gift without merit of our own.

In the rest of St. Paul's work the historian Luke does not record any teaching of the apostle, in which the primary blessing of the redemption through Christ is expressly set forth. A number of baptisms are mentioned as that of Lydia, of the jailor and his household, of Crispus and other Corinthians, and of still others, but here also the particular fruits of baptism are not stated. The discourse too delivered on Mars' hill was not finished, it seems, having been interrupted by the philosophers when Paul began to speak of the resurrection of Christ. Paul however in his own account before King Agrippa of his conversion, speaks definitely of the purpose of his mission among the Gentiles: "that they may receive *forgiveness of sins*, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me" (ch. 26, 18). This declaration gives the keynote to all his missionary labor, that it is to bring primarily forgiveness of sins to the unsaved as the basis for the hope of eternal life.

Without now laying claim to anything like critical thoroughness, I have nevertheless in a sufficiently careful man-

ner, it seems to me, examined the book of Acts, and as the result this statement seems warranted, that whenever the primary blessings of the redemption of Christ, or of conversion to Him, or of faith in Him, are expressly spoken of, then forgiveness of sins invariably stands first in the list, and that when only general terms are used to express the fruits of redemption a closer analysis, so far as this is possible, leads to the same result. The final conclusion then is this that in preaching Christ to the unsaved, no matter to what race or people or to what clan of society they may belong, or what their standing in culture and morality may be, Christ must be presented primarily as the means for the forgiveness of sins; that remission of sins is the first blessing to be sought by those who are seeking the salvation of their souls. To preach Christ means then to preach Him primarily as the atonement for sin. And when remission of sins is here called the *primary* blessing, the word is taken in the sense of first in consideration, without saying that it is the first as to essentials or even the first in importance. It may be misleading to speak without any restriction of this or that fruit of redemption as more essential or more important than others. They are all essential and all important, each however in its own way. Forgiveness of sins is essential and so is the inner new life essential, but each in its own way. They are each in its own way equally important. Yet there is a certain order in the reception of these gifts by the believer, and when that is made the object of inquiry remission of sins always forces itself to the front and demands the first consideration. The thoroughly penitent man first of all seeks the assurance that his sins are forgiven. He makes that the condition of peace for his soul, and for that reason already the assurance of forgiveness becomes the critical substratum for the new life. Where there is forgiveness of sins there is peace with God and readiness to serve Him.

The practical purpose of this brief study is to fortify against an evident present tendency of laying undue stress upon Christ *in* us and of minimizing or entirely ignoring the importance of Christ *for* us. There are those who have much to say about preaching Christ only, but it is His life in us, as a Christlike life, that they emphasize and ignore Him as the atonement for sin. Our study has shown that the atonement is of primary consideration. It might be objected that too much has been proven, and that therefore really nothing has been proven, since scarcely anything was

said about the inner life following conversion, and that this might leave the impression that forgiveness of sins was about the only blessing to be considered. The reply is that not much was said because our sources do not say much about it. The book of Acts is not the place where this matter is discussed. We have the account here not of established and growing congregations, but of the establishing of congregations. To find what the apostles have to say about Christ in us or the new inner life, we must study the epistles. But all this shows that remission of sins is the matter of primary consideration in bringing the Gospel to the unsaved. Nor dare this primary character of remission of sins be lost sight of in the work of building up among believers. They must always be made conscious of the fact that their forgiveness constitutes the fundamental ethical relation by which they have become reconciled with God and by which they are made capable of serving Him. Christ has "purchased and won me from all sin, from death, and from the power of the devil, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood and with His innocent suffering and death, *that I may be His own, and live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness.*"

Another purpose of this study is reassurance that the Lutheran Church, when she made justification through faith in Christ her primary fundamental doctrine, was not guilty of an error, and that thus she stands on the right and apostolic basis for thorough and successful missionary work. If she has not been as active in the missionary field as she ought to have been, the fault must not be sought in her interpretation of this cardinal doctrine.

MANY AND LONG CEREMONIES.

BY REV. L. M. HUNT, A. B., THORNVILLE, O.

That which is truly essential to the Church, is the preaching of the Word and the right administration of the Sacraments. They are essential, because they are the means which God uses to regenerate and to convert sinful man and to continue him in the way of life.

Christians are not only to see that the Word is preached and the Sacraments administered, but they themselves are

to engage in public worship. They are not only to pray, praise, and give thanks as individuals in private, but as a body also, at all times and in all places, and therefore in the congregation, or communion of saints.

The exact form in which public worship shall manifest itself, or be carried on, just how much shall be included, the number of prayers, or of hymns, or how much Scripture shall be read, how great a part of the service shall belong to the minister, or how little to the congregation, what ceremonies shall be used or what omitted,—all these are questions that are not decided in express terms by the Word. Hence they all belong to the *Adiaphora*, or things indifferent.

But concerning Ecclesiastical Ceremonies, the *adiaphora*, or things indifferent, the X Article of the Formula of Concord teaches: "Usages which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God's Word are in themselves no part of divine worship proper: in them the Church may make such changes as are needed, due regard being had to prudence and forbearance. * * * * No Church should condemn another because of unlikeness of ceremonies, if they agree in doctrine and in all its parts, and in the legitimate use of the Sacraments." (Dr. C. P. Krauth, *Conserv. Reform.* page 321.)

In these times when the trend seems to be ritualistic, prudence is to be exercised lest the ceremonies become the more impressive part of the service, while the Word and the Sacraments become mere contingents and occupy subordinate positions, as is shown in the history of the Church in the past.

While religion in the stricter sense is spiritual and intended for the soul, and hence, it may be claimed, needs no ceremonies; yet the teaching and practicing that religion, which is our public worship, belongs to man. Man has a body as well as a soul, and only in the union of the two does the proper being consist. The body needs training as the soul needs to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

For the training of the body especially externals in religion, as rites and ceremonies, are necessary. Then it is by these externals that we are able to embody the spiritual in religion. The hearing and seeing God's Word is the evidence to us that He is present in His house. Seeing the water and hearing the word again proves to us that the triune God is present in baptism. In like manner the bread

and the wine and the recitation of the words of the institution are the testimonies that Christ is truly present in the Holy Supper.

From these externals in religion that are necessary, and because the Church has the liberty to introduce new forms or to change old usages, that in themselves are no part of divine worship proper, there have come countless rites and ceremonies that are not necessary, and sometimes on account of their beauty, number, and length are fascinating and dangerous; for "men are too often captivated with the external grandeur, at the expense of the heavenly and spiritual aspect of religion.

It is not against these ceremonies that are necessary to instruct the unlearned, (For therefore alone we have need of ceremonies, that they may teach the unlearned. Augs. Con. Art. XXIV.) nor against a prudent number to beautify the service, but against those under which dangers lurk or in whose wake they follow, that the conservative Lutheran lifts his voice.

The worship of the Church of Rome consists of so many Pater Nosters, Ave Marias, beads, penances, pilgrimages, and adoration of saints, that, after doing all these things, but little time or ability would be left to study the Bible, if these people were allowed the use of the Book. Then, comparatively, the actual service consists of so much ceremony and so little Gospel, that the hearer is not much impressed with the Gospel, but very forcibly struck with the ceremonies and traditions.

Almost nothing is said of the doctrine of the righteousness of faith that must stand forth and have the preeminence in the Church; of the merit of Christ that must be well known by the people; and of the faith which believes that sins are forgiven for Christ's sake, and which must be highly exalted. These doctrines were almost wholly smothered with rites and ceremonies. For there was a time when "All Christianity was thought to be an observation of certain holidays, rites, fasts, and attire."

But when it was seen by the Reformers, that these human arrangements too often drew men's attention *from* instead of *to* the Word (Matt. 15, 9.) and their consciences were burdened by trying to observe all these little things instead of the weightier matters (Matt. 23, 23.) and many were driven to despair, the Church broke loose from its old moorings. And when the general opinion not only of the teachers, but also of the people was that many rites

and long ceremonies, tend to obscure the Gospel rather than to throw light on its teachings, the pendulum in some places swung to the other side, and such men as Carlstadt, Storch, and Münzer came forward denouncing pictures, and attempting to break down altars, and to abolish the clergy and theological learning.

Luther, the most conservative of the Protestant Reformers, recognized the need as well as freedom in the use of ceremonies, and therefore retained all that could be retained and used without sin.

The Lutheran Church following the great Reformer shows her conservatism nowhere more than in the order of her service. She carefully eliminated from the service all that was heathenish, superstitious, legendary, or ludicrous, or that in any way obscured or detracted from the pure Gospel. On the other hand she just as carefully retained all that could be used with profit and order in the Church.

“Concerning Ecclesiastical Rites, they (the Lutheran Churches) teach that those rites are to be observed which may be observed without sin, and are profitable for tranquillity and good order in the Church. * * * They are also to be admonished that human traditions instituted to propitiate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith.” Aug. Con. Art. XV.

The liturgical service of the Lutheran Church as it stands to-day is eminently Scriptural, symmetrical, and full. “It begins the service proper in the *Introit*; it mounts to rapture at the beatific vision in the *Gloria in Excelsis*; it bows in prayer in the *Collect*; it hears the voice of God in the *Epistle* and the *Gospel*; it returns the answer of the congregation in the *Creed*; it gives wing to Christian song in the *Hymns*; it renders the sacrifice of praise in the *General Prayer*, and of gifts in the *Offertory*; and then it departs with the trinal *Benediction*.” (J. B. Remensynder, D. D.).

When one examines the Morning Service of the Ohio Synod as printed in her liturgies and church hymnals, he will find the main parts of a Christian service, without any dangers at any place. The preaching of the Word occupies the most prominent place in the whole service; and the sermon is expected to be a preaching of the Word, and not of human wit, wisdom, or philosophy. It is true the Offer-tory is not mentioned by name, but it is practiced by almost all our pastors and congregations. Our service does not

contain too much; it is not too long, difficult or burdensome for the common people, but is plain and simple, yet full and dignified in its arrangement.

It is not the intention of the writer to enter into the extremities and extravagancies into which many fell when the pendulum swung from the multitudinous ceremonies of Rome to the bare service of some churches, or from Rome's machinelike religion to the whims and fancies of the individual in his imaginary freedom from any order of service.

The Lutheran Church believes its religion to be the pure religion of Christ, and that one should be able, at any time and place, on entering a church, to distinguish its religion from any other religion, by its forms, usages, rites and ceremonies, as well as by the contents of the sermon.

In the early days of the Reformation, the Church of England eliminated many ceremonies and changed many forms of the old Romish liturgy, but as time draws along she enlarges her liturgical forms, until the rector of the Church of England finds it but a short step to the Church of Rome.

It is stated on good authority that a Romish priest who was engaged in missionary work not long ago, was very much embarrassed on account of the great likeness between the ceremonies which he used in his own services and the heathenish rites practiced by the people among whom he was missionating.

It is the chaff that conceals the sound wheat, the corrosion that dulls the clear ring of the pure gold and silver, the decay and rubbish that hide the diamond and the sparkle of the diamond of God's Word, that is to be swept away; and in His service in His house, the light of His Word must be allowed to strike with full force upon the hearts of the children of men.

A MIRROR FOR PASTORS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GUTHÉ BY REV. W. E.
TRESSEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE SUFFERING OF THE PASTOR.**¶60. SUFFERING — THE APPOINTED PORTION OF ALL
CHRIST'S SERVANTS.**

In the life of the Lord not only the opposition between contemplation and the practical life is harmoniously solved, but also that between doing and suffering. Throughout Christ's working there moves an undercurrent of suffering and His suffering was no mere passivity, but an energetic activity: at no moment during His suffering did He intermit — so long as the possibility therefor existed — to work upon and for others. His conduct under suffering was "a continued deepening of obedience to the Father and of love toward men." It was necessary for Christ to suffer that thus His work might be perfected and crowned. "*Ought not Christ to have suffered these things?*" (Luke 24, 26).

In His working and suffering the Lord has left His servants an example: they also should combine the two, they also can not perfect the appointed work without suffering. Through suffering the Lord, who was holy and unsullied, was perfected, and we sinful children of men can still less become qualified for our task without suffering. "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. — If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" (Matt. 10, 24, 25). "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake," said the Lord (Matt. 10, 22), when He sent forth His apostles as sheep in the midst of wolves. Paul, the chosen instrument, writes of himself: "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. 6, 17). And he lays this upon the heart of his beloved pupil Timothy: "Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. 2, 3). The *tentatio*, with the *oratio* and the *meditatio* forms the triad that constitutes the theologian.

¶61. THE KINDS OF PASTORAL SUFFERING.

Those know their theology poorly, says Lütkemann, who ever live along pleasantly and have no worry and temptation to speak of. A theologian, who has not yet studied

in the university of suffering, may have appropriated much theological knowledge from without and may also have tasted some grace, but still he does not really know the Scriptures. "Not written without tears, not received without tears" — remarks Bengel on the Revelation. Unless we walk the ways of suffering, God's ways will not become rightly plain to us. "Real piety and the understanding what it is are to be learned only in the school of suffering." Goethe too had an inkling of this. Even Hannibal's soldiers, who had been hardened by toil and suffering, had conquered the enemy at Lake Trasimene and Cannae, became effeminated and enervated during the good days at Capua. If everything goes smoothly for the warriors of Christ, if they begin to feel comfortable, the thought of eternity grows weak, and with it the willingness and power for contending against the flesh and the world. Suffering has a noble mission: it is intended to withdraw the heart from the world and draw it towards the Lord, to cleanse from sin and educate in virtue. "Heathenism or the standpoint of the natural man has no room for suffering. From this point of view the healthy life manifests itself either in activity or in enjoyment, that is, the appropriation of the goods of this life; and if any suffering should enter as a disturbing element, it is looked upon only as blind, inexplicable fate. The greatest endeavors are made to escape, or to get around suffering; when, however, it can be parried no longer, it is to be borne with resignation and, so far as possible, one should harden himself into indifference towards it. The natural man, then, considers suffering as that which should not be, as a hostile power, which disturbs the beauty and the object of life. But in Christ we behold suffering as that which should be. For there is something else that should not be, but which man himself has brought into reality, namely sin and guilt. These, which should not have been, should not be, have notwithstanding entered into the world, and just on this account must there be suffering, that guilt and sin can be removed." Only in communion with Christ, who is the propitiation for our sins, does man recognize the ethical importance of suffering. Tried bearers of the cross call the cross a good evil and consolingly cry to each companion in tribulation: If thou desirest the light, accept the cross (*si vis lucem, accipe crucem!*)!

The *tentatio* of the pastor is twofold: an outward and an inner. The inner cross is the sorrow on account of the imperfections and disadvantages of the congregation, on account of the lukewarmness, indifference and enmity to the

Lord and His kingdom. The pain becomes all the more intense, if the pastor thinks that those who presided over the seven congregations of Asia Minor were made responsible for the circumstances of the churches (Rev. 2 and 3). To the pastor's internal cross belongs also the sadness at the thought that his loving intentions, which move him to seek and to save the lost according to the Lord's example and direction, are misunderstood by so many souls. How deeply a Paul was affected by these internal sufferings, his tears show us (Acts 20, 31; Phil. 3, 18). Tears of pastoral mercy were not strangers to the Church Father Augustine, from whom we have the notable sentence: Prayers and tears are the weapons of the Church. Dominicus, the founder of the celebrated order of preachers, shed tears of compassion over sinners whom he saw persisting in their sin, giving offence to the congregation and hastening to their own ruin. That sorrow for souls, which travel the broad road and would not let themselves be guided upon the narrow way, lay heavy upon Luther's heart, is shown, among other things, by his hymn: Ach Gott vom Himmel sieh darein! Heinrich Müller, who wrote many a sermon with tears, himself belonged to the class of those, of whom he writes: "Ah, how many a pastor feels the cold sweat break out, when he must stand at the head and fight for our souls even unto the shedding of blood!" To the internal *tentatio*, must be added, as a rule, the external, to the cross upon the heart also that upon the back. That the servant of Christ, who has to preach the word of the cross and of the crucifixion of the old man, has more to suffer than the ordinary disciple of Christ, is not to be wondered at: the truth produces hatred! Many a servant of Christ can speak of an Iliad of ills. Luther, mindful of the word, Luke 6, 26: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you!" would rather be a theologian of the cross than a theologian of glory. In Melanchthon's daily prayer was also the petition: *Tecum pati, tecum flere* (to suffer with Thee, to weep with Thee). Now the hatred, then the reward (nunc odium, tum praemium) ! was the comfort of John Mathesius. H. Müller writes in the preface to his school of the cross, repentance and prayer: When seven years ago I was through God's strange providence called into the office of the ministry, I imagined that this office would bring me, if not many, yet some good, happy days. I thought, that preachers would be loved and honored by every man, even that men feared their very shadow. But experience proves something quite different. The first taste was a bitter taste.

Then the devil in his fury wanted to test his knighthood against me. Scarcely had I put on my cap, when it already became heavy to carry, so that, as my most dear congregation knows, I preached my very first sermon with many tears. I experienced, that immediately my pleasure was changed into a burden and that my God would grant me little joy in my office. Therefore I prepared myself for tribulation, which often befalls me, not to speak of the internal fear and anxiety, in which I have spent many a night with sighing. For, my friend, who would not fret, if he saw that all weeping, admonition, threatening, rebuke, warning, were in so many instances vain, that one lamb after the other fell into the jaws of the hellish wolf; that such a small number of pious people remained, and abominations increased on every hand, that pleasure in God's Word grew less from day to day, and on the other hand the love of vanity ever grew more, so that also some among those, who should have been to others an example of love, were filled with wrath, envy and deceit? Also to many my outward strife is not unknown; at one time the proud lifted themselves up against me, because I spoke the truth; at another time, as Paul also laments, I fell into danger among false brethren, who publicly found fault with and abused my work, in which I sought the honor of my God; again a false friend under pretence, malignantly laid a snare for me; but praised be God, who ever gave and still gives me the victory daily.

John Val. Andreæ in his versified pastoral theology cries out to all honest servants of Christ:

Weh euch, so man euch zu viel lobt!
Wohl euch, wenn die Welt heftig tobt!
Weh euch, so euch der Dienst wird süß!
Wohl euch, so ihr find't viel Verdriess!
Weh euch, so euch die Welt gefällt,
Wohl euch, so sie euch Fallen stellt!
Weh euch, so ihr auf Titel schaut!
Wohl euch, so wenigs euch vertraut.
So könnt ihr Gottes Haushalter sein,
Der Welt ein Dorn, ein Ruth' und Pein.

The Lord Himself gives the best comfort to His servants, who must suffer for His name's sake, when He says "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven" (Matt. 5, 11. 12).

¶62. SUFFERING IN THE SERVICE OF CHRIST—A SACRIFICE.

Paul, this wonderful cross-bearer, considered his suffering in the service of Christ as a being offered, Phil. 2, 17 and 2 Tim. 4, 6. It is therefore truly biblical, when Melanchthon in his *Loci* under the beautiful section *de calamitatibus et cruce* calls Christian suffering a *sacrificium*. Christian suffering of course only receives the consecration of a sacrifice, because it is patiently borne in obedience to God. At the head of the virtues by which Christ's servants should approve themselves, Paul places "much patience," 2 Cor. 6, 4. Christian patience, which is something totally different from the heathen stoical patience, is according to Gal. 5, 22 a fruit of the Holy Spirit, therefore, as Augustine rightly says, a gift of God, and just therefore Christian patience is a power, equipped with the power to bear the appointed suffering with gentleness. If the servant of Christ is sometimes about to lose patience on account of the stubbornness of his fellow-sinners, let him each time remember how often he resists the Lord and that the Lord yet does not become weary of patiently bearing with him. I tolerate, because I am tolerated! That is the basis for holy tolerance, which is indeed hostile to sin, but friendly to the sinner. Not only our doing but also our suffering, breathes love. We should learn to exercise not only the active, but also the passive love in the school of our Lord, who says: "learn of me!" (Matt. 10, 29). Would that the image of Christ, who endured such great contradiction of sinners against Himself, mirrored itself in all His servants! O that all, who call themselves God's servants, could truthfully say with Luther: Whatever we do in preaching and suffering, let us do all to the glory of God and to the salvation of the elect!

NEW TESTAMENT CHRONOLOGY.

BY REV. PROFESSOR GEORGE H. SCHODDE, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

The *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, by Prof. Theodore Zahn, of the University of Erlangen, of which the first volume of 489 quarto pages appeared in 1897, has now been completed by the publication of the second and larger volume of 656 pages, the book bearing the date of 1899, although published in December 1898. In a *Zeittafel* appended to this volume, p. 640-643, the author gives in the form of a double chronological list a bird's-eye view of his results, which as coming from the leading specialist in Germany in the department of early Christians, is deserving of special study. We accordingly reproduce these tables here.

Roman and Jewish.

Deposing Pilate and Caiaphas from office 36.

Emperor Tiberius dies 16 March 37.

Caligula 16 March 37 to 24 January 41.

Birth of Nero and of Josephus 37.

Herod Agrippa I., 37-44.

Persecution of Jews in Alexandria 38.

Attempt of Caligula to erect his statue in the temple 39-40.

Emperor Claudius, 24 Jan. 41—13 Oct. 54.

Christian.

Death and Resurrection of Christ, probably 30 A. D.

The facts recorded Acts 1-8, 1, between 30 and 34.

The conversion of St. Paul.

Paul tarries at Damascus for three years, which stay is interrupted by a journey to Arabia (Gal. 1, 17).

Flight from Damascus, first visit to Jerusalem, Residence at Tarsus, (Gal. 1, 18-24; 2 Cor. 11, 32; Acts 9, 23-33; 22, 17-21; 26, 20, Rom. 15, 19) 38 Peter in Jaffa and Cæsarea (Acts 9, 32; 11, 18; 19, 7).

Agabus and other prophets in Antiochia (Acts 11, 27-28) about 40.

Luke a member in the congregation there.

Paul brought back from Tarsus by Barnabas to Antiochia (Acts 11, 25; 2 Cor. 12, 2) summer or fall of 43.

Death of James the son of Zebedee, Imprisonment of Pe-

Roman and Jewish.

Herod Agrippa died, summer 44.

Festus, Procurator, 44–46 (or 47).

Tiberius Alexander, Procurator, 46 (or 47)–48.

Famine in Judæa.

Cumanus Procurator 48–52.

Sergius Paulus, Proconsul of Cyprus, 50 (at any rate *not* 51–53).

Felix Procurator, 52 to summer of 60.

Expulsion of Jews from Rome about 52.

Gallus Proconsul in Achaia probably from Spring of 53.

Christian.

ter, flight of Peter and the other apostles out of Jerusalem about Easter 44.

Journey of Paul and Barnabas with collection to Jerusalem and arrival of Mark in Antiochiae (Acts 11, 30; 12, 25) fall of 44.

Paul and Barnabas active as teachers and missionaries in Antiochiae to the spring of 50.

Visit of Peter and other Ju-dæans to Antiochiae.

Epistle of James, about 50.

First mission tour of Paul (Acts 3, 4–14, 27; Gal 4, 13) spring of 50 to fall of 51.

Meeting of apostles in Jerusalem (Acts 15, 1–29; Gal. 2, 1–10) about opening of 52.

Beginning of second mission-ary tour (Acts 15, 40) spring of 52.

Arrival in Corinth, about No-vember 52. Epistle to Galati-ans, beginning of 53. Arrival of Silas and Timothy in Corinth (Acts 18, 5; 1 Th. 3, 6).

First Epistle to the Thessa-lonians, spring 53. Tried be-fore Gallus (Acts 18, 12–17, cf. 1 Thess. 3, 2).

Second Epistle to Thessalonians, summer 53. Journey from Corinth to Ephesus (Acts 18, 18–21, beginning of the three years mentioned Acts 20, 31) before Pentecost or about May 54.

Continuation of journey to Cæsarea (but not to Jerusalem) and Antiochiae (Acts 18, 21–22).

Journey of Apollos from Alexandria by way of Ephesus to Corinth (Acts 18, 24–28).

Roman and Jewish.

Emperor Nero 13 Oct. 54 to
9 June 68.

Christian.

Beginning of the third mission tour from Antiochia to Ephesus (Acts 18, 24-28), probably late in the summer of 54.

Paul settles down at Ephesus about February 55.

Transfer to the hall of Tyran-nus, about Pentecost 55.

Brief visit to Corinth from Ephesus.

Last letter of Paul to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 5, 9) about end of 56 or beginning of 57.

Paul sends Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia and then to Corinth (Acts 19, 22; 1 Cor. 4, 17).

Letter of the Corinthians to Paul (1 Cor. 7, 1). First Epistle to the Corinthians, about Easter (1 Cor. 5, 7; 16, 8) 57.

Return of Timothy to Ephesus. Sending of Titus to Corinth.

Riot of Demetrius (Acts 19, 23-41).

Departure of Paul and Timothy from Ephesus by way of Troas to Macedonia, (Acts 20, 1, cf. 2 Cor. 1, 8; 2, 12; 7, 5) about or after Pentecost 57.

Meeting of Titus and Paul in Macedonia (2 Cor. 7, 5-15).

Second Epistle to the Corinthians, about November or December 57.

Journey of Paul from Macedonia to Corinth (Acts 20, 2) about the year 58.

Epistle to Romans written during three months stay in Greece, especially Corinth (Acts 20, 31; Rom. 15, 25; 16, 1) about February 58.

Roman and Jewish.

Porcius Festus Procurator from summer of 60 to beginning of summer of 62.

Burning of Rome, 19-24 of July 64.

Christian.

Journey by way of Macedonia (at Philippi, Easter of 60, Acts 20, 6) Troas, Miletus, etc., to Jerusalem. Arrival at Jerusalem and beginning of captivity at Cæsarea, Pentecost 58

Defense of Paul before Festus, late in summer of 60.

Departure from Cæsarea to Rome, (Acts 27, 1, 9) September 60.

Arrived at Rome (Acts 28, 16, cf. v. 11) March 61.

Epistles to Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, summer of 62.

Second Epistle of Peter, about 62.

Matthew writes his Aramaic gospel in Palestine about 62.

End of the "two whole years" mentioned Acts 28, 30, about April 63.

Epistle to Philippians, summer 63. Paul set free, late in summer of 63. Journey of Paul to Spain, fall of 63 or spring of 64.

Arrival of Peter in Rome, fall of 63 or spring of 64.

First Epistle of Peter, spring of 64.

Mark in Rome engaged in the preparation of his gospel, summer of 64.

Nero's persecution of Christians and crucifixion of Peter, fall of 64.

Return of Paul from Spain; visits the Eastern congregations; writes 1 Tim, and Tit., spring to fall of 65.

Paul tarries in Nicopolis, winter of 65-66.

Roman and Jewish.

Beginning of the Jewish war, 66.

Victory of Jews over Cestius November 66.

War in Galilee, 67.

Civil war in Jerusalem, winter of 67-68.

Emperor Nero dies 9 June 68.

Galba dies 19 Jan. 69; Otho dies 16 April 69; Vitellius dies 21 Dec. 69.

Vespasian proclaimed Emperor in Alexandria, 1 July 69.

Beginning of seige of Jerusalem, by Titus, April 70.

Jerusalem taken and temple destroyed, Aug. 70.

Titus Emperor 23 June 59 to 13 Sept. 81.

Domitian Emperor, 13 Sept. 81 to 18 Sept. 96.

Nerva Emperor 18 Sept. 96 to 25 Jan. 98.

Trojan Emperor, 25 Jan. 98 to Aug. 117.

Christian.

Death of James, the brother of Jesus, in Jerusalem, 66.

Return of Paul to Rome, spring of 66. Paul arrested, writes 2 Tim. summer of 66.

Paul decapitated end of 66 or about 67.

Flight of Christians from Jerusalem to Pella, about 67.

John and other disciples (Philipp, Aristion, etc.,) leave Jerusalem for the province of Asia, about 68.

Epistle of Jude, about 75.

Gospel and Acts of Luke, about 75.

Epistle to Hebrews, about 80.

Origin of the Greek Matthew, about 85.

The gospel and the Epistles of John, 80-90.

Apocalypse of John, about 95.

Death of John, about 100.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

AUGUST, 1899.

No. 4.

THE CHARGE OF NARROWNESS.

BY PROF. M. LOY, D.D., COLUMBUS, O.

II.

Perhaps we have said all on this subject that is necessary to accomplish our purpose, at least so far as this lies in our power. But to avoid tediousness and the diversion of thought from the main question, we omitted some important phases of the narrow views which lead opponents of Christianity and Lutheranism to charge us with narrowness. It seems to us worth our while, therefore, to recur to the subject, in the hope of making it apparent that the narrowness lies not with faithful Christians, but elsewhere.

We would now make a distinction which in our general discussion would not, as it seemed to us, be explained without interrupting the current of thought and damaging the completeness of views. It pertains to the concessions which we have cordially made to the enemies of Christianity, and to the opponents of the Lutheran Church; and further to our contention that the narrowness charged, even if the charge was sustained, proves nothing in regard to the particular questions in dispute. We did not speak unadvisedly, and have nothing to regret. But when there is a disagreement on any point, the difference between the considerations which decide it under a certain principle, and that principle itself must not be ignored. That distinction must needs be made in the interest of truth. For instance, assuming that man is a mere machine which is run by fate in common with all other creatures, there is as much virtue in a hog that

pushes others out of the feed trough as in a man that denies himself in order to give his bread to a hungry fellow-man. According to the theory adopted there is virtue in neither because both do what they must, and having no choice have no responsibility. If therefore the question were started whether the hog or the man is the narrower, there would be no basis for an argument. The question is obviously irrelevant, and our concession does not apply, because the principle is not conceded. Again, if the question arose whether the man who denies himself in order to give his bread to a suffering fellow-man is broader of mind and larger of heart than his neighbor, who is not so ready to distribute his possessions, the decision is not as easy as it looks. Evidently the liberal soul that is ever ready to communicate seems right and good and commendable. But in intelligent minds the difference between sympathetic impulse and wise conduct will have its influence. Shall I deny myself to help along the lazy fellow who will not work and eat his own bread, but imposes himself as a burden upon others with the preposterous claim that he must live? Why must he live? And when a person assumes that human happiness means indulgence in the pleasures of the flesh, and pronounces us narrow when we disallow his assumption, what shall we say? His riotous living is all right according to his principle, but it is all wrong when judged by the everlasting law of righteousness. When a man regulates his conduct in accordance with his best knowledge and judgment of the earth and earthly things, he is relatively wise. But when he confines himself to these is he not absolutely narrow? Of course, the affirmative answer can be given only by those who have a wider view. The beauty of the lilies and the glory of the stars will not be acknowledged by the poor creatures that are blind. We admit that these can do no better than judge according to their gifts and their limitations, but when this concession is made we by no means admit that their gift with its limitation is the rule by which the universe is to be judged. When infidels form their opinions according to such little light as nature gives them of the will of God and the design of creation, and especially of the destiny of man, we must in reason recognize their efforts to understand the whole. But we cannot admit that they understand it all. Some do the best they can within their limitations, and when we concede this and so far

honor them, we do not mean to admit that their narrow view is decisive of the great questions of man's eternal destiny, which are those in debate between us. They charge us with narrowness, because they do not recognize the broader principle of supernatural revelation in the added light of which so many things are known to be otherwise than the natural man assumes.

Hence it is apparent that when a man charges us with narrowness he may be sincere in his assumption of intellectual or moral superiority, and that we may deem it wise to let that pass, and not allow the point in controversy to be clouded and finally resolved into a trivial case of personal bickering; that he may view that point with a vision of very narrow range, within which he may seem to be right; and that, in the further pursuit of the question, that of principle may ultimately be of more importance than the original point of difference.

In our contentions with opponents of Christianity the charge of narrowness usually pertains to the head, or to the intellectual faculty and learning necessary to master the subject and qualify for correct judgment. It is mortifying to hear such railing accusations, and they tend to provoke the flesh to wrath, so that the controversy is easily degraded to a miserable wrangle about personal endowment and acquirement, in reference to which the parties engaged are usually the poorest judges, because the selfishness of the flesh makes their view lamentably narrow. In but too many cases it resolves itself into an effort of the blind to lead the blind, with the enhancement of the wretchedness that is involved in their antagonism. This vigilant Christians will persistently avoid, humbly admitting their own limited ability and scholarship, and readily conceding the possible superiority of their antagonists in this regard without in any respect or degree implying or furnishing reason to suspect that therefore the error is probably the truth. That is a different matter, which is not to be decided by the narrow gauge of personal appreciation and conceit of self, but by a standard which is higher and more reliable, and to which rational creatures are referred. Accordingly that standard itself may become the main point of controversy in any special case, and has become the acknowledged point of controversy in all cases between Christians and infidels, whether these be heathens or Mahomedans, Jews or Deists. It is finally a question of principle,

a difference in regard to which makes the decision of a controversy impossible so long as that difference is not removed and a common ground for argument is not attained. The dispute therefore is reduced to the fundamental question as to what is the final court of appeal for humanity.

In our contentions with opponents of the Lutheran Church the charge of narrowness usually pertains to the heart, or to the moral or emotional advancement necessary to appreciate and decide the question between us and other churches. That does not exclude the arrogant pretense of superior bearing on occasions which would furnish any chance of rendering it respectable; nor does it exclude the appeal to the Holy Scriptures as decisive when seemingly that can be used against us.

As a rule the Romanists are not disposed to rest their case on an appeal to the Bible. They reserve as a refuge the authority of a traditional word of God that is not written in the Scriptures, and as a last resort the supposed infallibility of the pope, who may decide against Scripture and against reason; and still, as the supposed medium of the highest of all divine revelations, claim absolute submission to his will. They have little to expect when they address themselves directly to the thinking faculty of men; they have reason to expect much when they address themselves to human sensibility and secure the inclinations of the heart in their favor, assured that in due time this will sway the intellect and make the thing desired seem reasonable. Rome satisfies the esthetic nature in its sensuous worship; it satisfies the longings of reason for some decision of the questions which it can not solve and for some consequent rest that seems reasonable, notwithstanding its unreason; it flatters human nature by making the eternal outcome dependent on the creature's effort and work, and thus enlists the pride of the flesh in its cause. No wonder that it is a power in the earth! When Romanists make a religion of their devotion to the beautiful and the weird combinations of mind and matter suggested by nature, be that imagination as unfathomable mystery to the reason, they naturally find their dreamy religion represented in the mystic rites of Rome, and seek their pleasure there; without having the power to discern that the religion which they adopt is not Christianity, but simply heathenism, which only entangles Christ and His Church, and which would flourish with-

out a pope, as it has flourished before human sin devised the system of popery. When men of intelligence reason on life and death with only the light which nature furnishes, and therefore with no guide beyond the narrow limits of this earthly scene and its painful disappointments and dismal failures, Romish pretensions of infallibility have a seductive force, and men despairing of finding a solution of the problems confronting them naturally prefer the intellectual slavery of popery to utter intellectual bankruptcy. And when earnest-minded men who, under the mistaken notions of the mind that has never passed into the wide domain of grace, have struggled in vain to find rest for their souls in their strenuous efforts to work righteousness, or when they have failed to get sympathy in their contention that these efforts, in their intention and in their products, are righteous, they naturally resort to Rome, which recognizes their work as meritorious and welcomes them as Christian heroes. The broad scheme of Rome receives them all, and we must bear the charge of narrowness, because we cannot concede that those who are traveling the broad road to destruction are in equally the same condition as those who are on the narrow path that leads to life eternal by the grace of God in Christ, who alone is the way and the truth and the life. It is plain why we should seem to them narrow-hearted, when their hearts are wide enough to embrace all who will submit to the pope. That they refuse to recognize Christians, who gladly accept the Saviour, but will not recognize the pope, naturally does not seem to them narrow, because their vision does not reach beyond popery and the very small portion of mankind that is brought under its supremacy.

Reformed denominations in our age, and especially in our land, have so largely imbibed the thoughts and imitated the ways of Rome, that we Lutherans appear to them to justify the charge of narrowness against us, for the double reason that we will not admit the claims of nature against grace, and that we will not admit the rights of the human mind in its activity of intellect and sensibility and will as against the revelation of the Lord's will given us in Holy Scriptures. Political economy, literary greatness and work, scientific attainments and results, philosophical speculations, humanitarian projects, schemes to attract the multitude, and whatever else human reason may devise to save the Church from destruction and ren-

der it more effective in the community, are promulgated in the churches; and Lutherans must be content to suffer the reproach of narrowness when they cannot see how these human contrivances can save a sinful soul from death; and cannot concede that such devices have any rights in the kingdom of Christ, which is not of this world; or that this, being a kingdom of grace, can be built or maintained or extended by any powers of nature. When occasion offers Protestant sects will accuse us of narrowness of knowledge and thought; but mostly their charge is narrowness of heart, assuming that if we had the proper love for our fellow-men we could not insist on the truth as the Bible teaches and our Church confesses it, when so many are of a different opinion, and yet do so much for the welfare of our race. Is it kind and charitable to oppose the work and claim of well-meaning men when they erringly make Christianity to consist in good works, and yet manifestly labor to benefit mankind? Is it not narrowness of heart to refuse recognition as co-laborers in the cause of Christ to the whole crowd of professedly Christian reformers, who ride their hobbies in proud parade before people under the broad banner of human fraternity? It requires a large measure of grace to say no, as it does when the same question is asked in regard to professed Christians who in the name of the pope and the virgin and a variety of saints, do work which even heathens must join in praising. It certainly puts us Lutherans to the test. The judgment of human nature is evidently against us, and does not fail to manifest itself even in the Lutheran Church in opposition to those who reject all schemes and devices and societies whose hope of success rests on the proclivities and impulses of this nature, without regard to the power of grace. But the Lutheran Church has no reason to be dismayed, because there are larger questions than those presenting themselves in the immediate points of debate, and those who take the wider view can well afford, in their devotion to higher interests that involve the welfare of all mankind, to bear the reproach of narrowness, which eventually is such only to the narrow-minded and narrow-hearted, who have not sufficient knowledge to make account of things spiritual and eternal, and therefore cannot understand how a loving heart could in any case or in any degree refuse to co-operate with any humanitarian project, whether this is inaugurated by heathens or Christians. The charge is

cheap, that we have no love; and the inference is simple, that therefore we cannot understand the requirements of love and can have no impulse to fulfill them. Happily those who make it are not our judges on the last day, when it will become apparent whether they or we have had the larger love, both in its extension and its intension. We write this in the profound consciousness of our lack in this regard, but in the full assurance of faith as well that our salvation does not depend on our perfection of love as that human love is a result only of grace through Christ Jesus our Lord, so that the sinner's justification and sanctification are equally the gift of grace. Our performance amounts to little, but our Saviour amounts to much. This is decisive of many a point on which men engage in controversy.

The question between Christians and infidels, taking this term in the wide sense, including all who will not recognize the authority of any supernatural revelation as given in the Bible, is whether any account can be made of knowledge reaching beyond this present life and the destiny of our race in a future world. If there is an authority deciding that, it is narrowness to reject it, though it seem narrow to maintain that those who reject it remain in blindness. And this holds as well in as out of the visible church. A person who claims to be a Christian is just as narrow as a person who makes no such claim, when one as well as the other refuses to acknowledge the authority of the Word of God as given in Holy Scripture and revealing the love of God which provides salvation for all sinners in Jesus Christ, His incarnate Son. The point of controversy is therefore substantially the same between us and all our opponents. Some deny that we need a Saviour; some deny that Christ is the Saviour; some maintain that our energy will supply a sufficient Saviour; some insist that our salvation is a result of our virtue, combining the thought that we save ourselves and that we need no Saviour, besides ourselves, if any salvation be needed at all. The whole question is thus reduced to a narrow compass. It is that between nature and grace, between the thought and feeling of man as governed by grace and the thought and feeling of man as directed by his fallen nature. The ultimate point of conflict is thus made plain, and the principle according to which the point must be decided becomes apparent. Where then does the narrowness ultimately lie?

The question, though fundamentally one, as has been shown, has two aspects, which the interests of truth and righteousness require to be separately treated. For such separation in our thinking there are two reasons; first, that error may not take advantage of any confusion of thought that is so likely to arise when differences are not distinguished; and secondly, that wrong may not be done to one party by imputing to it the aberrations of another, though in general both stand on the same ground and apply the same principle. With some of our opponents the whole subject belongs to the science of epistemology; with others it belongs to the science of ethics, and reduces itself to a matter of morality. That is only a way which the learned have of saying that in one case the difference lies in the head, in the other it lies in the heart. In the one case the charge of narrowness means that we have not knowledge enough, in the other that we have not love enough. Thus reduced to a plain statement, how can any Christian wonder that we are ready to make concessions? And yet, when the principle is in question, how can any Christian wonder that we make no concessions? Our knowledge and our love are limited indeed, but that decides nothing in regard to the differences which result in controversy between us, because the little that we know from the Bible may be more than all the learning that men have derived from natural sources from the beginning of time, or even will be able to obtain; and because the little love which God has through faith bestowed on us by His grace in Christ Jesus our Lord, may be purer and deeper and broader than the utmost and best that nature can produce. Christians are therefore much to blame if in their modesty, which moves them to make no pretensions to great achievements on their own exalted path, they directly or indirectly admit that their plane is lower than that of the unbeliever or that their range of vision and of action is correspondingly narrower. In all humility we repudiate and scorn such an admission, because it reflects on the wisdom and mercy of our Lord, detracts from His glory, and hinders the salvation of man. Christian hearts can have no sympathy with such narrowness, however much they may have to suffer because of their wider view and larger love, which seems to the natural man so very narrow.

In the first place, as regards knowledge, believers in Christ have no rational ground to be scared by the high

pretensions put forth by scientists and others learned in the wisdom of this world. These know something though it would be wise on the part of most of them if they did not pretend to know so many things that are not so. But what they know in reality Christians know also, or at least have equal opportunity of knowing. So far is the truth which nature teaches from being the peculiar possession of scientists who have, because they accept, no other source of knowledge, that Christian students of nature have a means of insight into the meaning of all the works of creation which our fallen nature can never otherwise attain. Are they then narrow when they admit the broader light? Where this earth that we inhabit came from; what all its contents in mineral and vegetable and animal are designed for; what man with his superior powers and and conspicuous position is meant to accomplish; what is to be the outcome of all this marvelous clashing of heterogeneous elements; and what is to become of man in the general clash and final crash; who knows? It would be a dark and dismal outlook for men who see and think, if there were not a revelation given by the Maker of all that gives us light. This tells no things of importance which the works of nature do not reveal. Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it! In proportion as this Word becomes effectual in them they are modest people, who recognize their mental and moral limitations. But they know something which the natural sources of knowledge do not furnish, and which is of such fundamental import that it is called *the truth*. The promise is, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;" and the promise is fulfilled in every believing heart. Can believers then be faithful if they, fearing to be charged with self-conceit if they claim a knowledge that far surpasses in worth all the philosophy and science and learning of all the world, and fearing to be charged with narrowness if they practically make account of this knowledge in resisting errors that have the multitude in their favor, concede the infidel contentions that what nature does not teach they do not know? True Christians, knowing their duty and experiencing the impulse to confess Christ and to take up their cross and follow Him, are ashamed to raise such a question among their brethren. The concern of their souls is to promulgate and maintain revealed truth, and the very thought of unwillingness to suffer reproach in its furtherance would

be a trouble to them. We Christians know something from the Scriptures and are led by the Spirit to appreciate it, however narrow that knowledge and the practice that results may seem to those who do not recognize and appreciate it. The case is parallel to that of a person lacking one or the other of the senses and declaiming against the narrowness of another who has no such lack, but takes the presentations of all the senses into account; or that of a person judging only what the senses present, and denouncing the narrowness of those who will not permit the rational intuitions to be ruled out by such a narrow theory of knowledge; or that of the absolute idealists who complain of our narrowness in making account of existing things at all when they have demonstrated satisfactorily to themselves that these have no existence. The limitations of the human mind as a creature which the Creator has circumscribed within the bounds of His creative purpose, and, alas! the further limitations that have resulted from its abuse under the dominion of sin, warn us not to expect too much of natural reason. We err when we think that the human judgment is final, and we err doubly when we think that in its present condition it is normal. Its powers and consequently its activity were creatively limited, and when sin entered both its powers and its scope were circumscribed; because it ceased to recognize God and His absolute authority, thus sinking into a lower grade, and because it was thus excluded from the whole realm of the spiritual, outside of which there could be only darkness and death, notwithstanding the light of sun and moon and stars, and the animal life that stirs and makes commotion on earth.

There seems some force indeed in the argument that all this pertains to the spiritual and eternal interests of mankind, with which human science and learning does not desire to have anything to do; and that therefore all the professed knowledge derived from revelation is irrelevant to the question when earthly interests are in dispute. But there are three points which Christians are admonished to keep in mind throughout the whole controversy. One is that man is not a brûte, and that his final destiny does not lie within the confines of time; there is something beyond these earthly joys and sorrows. The second is that nature gives us no intelligent account of that which lies beyond this earth and its efficient courses and products in mind or matter. And the third is that

God who made all things also rules them all and works out His purpose in them all. No doubt to some, when it is said that the plan of salvation which Christians proclaim is a matter of the narrow circle called the Christian Church, the allegation appears reasonable. We Christians seem narrow, because we are a little flock, in comparison with which the crowd is large that marches forward on the broad road. In reference to this we need not say much, indeed we need say nothing when Christians are concerned. But those who know not Christ cannot see how the Christian revelation can have anything to do with their science and its results. We can tell them some things which they would do well to learn for the enlargement of their view and the broadening of their thoughts, and the knowledge of which, whether they will hear or forbear, makes us sure that the narrowness in scope and judgment is in principle at least not with those who know and make account of revealed truth.

If death, which is sure to come, and whose certainty is recognized as well by those who have no knowledge of its cause as by those who know that sin came into the world and death by sin ended all, it would require some strong thinking and rigid discipline to make it clear that the result of our labor on earth is worth the effort. Perhaps, on the principle that rational beings make the best of their situation, even if their case is desperate, the decision may be in the affirmative; but we cannot refrain from putting in the reminder, that all moral forces, which are such important features in the decision of such a question, invariably have their roots in other soil than that of nature, whether or not this enters explicitly into the human consciousness. The main point, however, that we have in view is not the decision of such subsidiary questions, which are entitled to consideration in their proper place, but which would here only divert our attention from the principle that is at stake and that is higher than the particular cases which must be decided by it and which present themselves for discussion under it. If death ended all, the scope of science and philosophy and all human learning would be palpably narrow; the farthest reach of all our thinking could only be that the trees we plant and the houses we build will furnish enjoyment to those who come after us, and they too after a little while will die. Again we must remind the poor mortals concerned in this play that all concern for posterity is a moral force

in our effort and work, which encounters so many obstacles and requires so much labor that does not afford the laborer any remuneration, has a ground only in realities that reach beyond the confines of time and cannot exist at all without this foundation.

The fundamental principle at stake is of the largest import. Does death end all? We do not blame the philosophers who rely on the knowledge which nature furnishes and know nothing beyond that, when they say that they do not know. Of course they do not know. How should they know anything beyond the narrow limits of the natural sources within which they are cramped by their own narrow choice? But is there not a possibility of knowing? When naturalists say no, we Christians with our larger knowledge, derived not from nature, but from revelation, say yes. That brings out in all its fullness the point of controversy. The question is not whether we know as much of science as the Darwinians, or as much of philosophy as the Hegelians, but whether nature in matter or mind reveals all that the human mind can know or ought to know in regard to its own powers and destiny. All empirical knowledge is of a relative sort, and can give us no assurance in regard to universal truth. And that sort of knowledge, so far as it is reliable at all, can be applied only in particular cases, where the circumstances determine the application. The principle always underlies the judgment. If the knowledge that we can attain by the study of nature is all that is attainable, we are ready to admit that many are our superiors in such attainment, and that when on this ground they pronounce us narrow they have the best of the argument, though we are not willing to extend this to all the parties engaged in the cause of Christianity against infidelity, because as a matter of fact some followers of Christ know more of natural science than their adversaries. But the principle always remains, whether when all the knowledge which nature is capable of communicating has been attained, the outcome is not lamentably narrow, seeing that the Creator and Lord of all has seen the narrowness resulting from sin and in mercy has given us a special revelation to extend our view and make wider judgments possible.

That our race is doomed to damnation we cannot expect scientists and philosophers to know. In their narrow field their eyes are holden. Impelled by their conceit

of knowledge and righteousness, they naturally deny it. How then can they have any proper appreciation of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus? By nature, which is their only guide, they know nothing of such a Redeemer. Of course, they think us narrow in accepting Him as our only help in time and our only hope in eternity. But do they not, as a matter of fact, need Him as well as we? The argument that this must depend on subjective conditions, is an arrant sophism. It is true that a person who does not know the nature of sin and with all his experience does not know that he is a poor, forlorn, condemned person, who feels no need of a Saviour, is not a fit subject of faith in Christ and of joy in the deliverance from death. In that respect the argument has plausibility. But when that is advanced to show that we Christians are urging our special thoughts which apply only to a narrow circle, and that we are therefore people of narrow minds who unreasonably strive to bind the requirements of our sect on the whole human race, can we accept the sophistry and admit the impeachment? We know some things which these people with all their learning do not know. It may seem immodest to maintain this, and may be offensive and provocative of scorn, but in all meekness and humility we insist on it, because we know it to be so, notwithstanding the limitations of learned people who lack the conditions of knowledge and assurance. To a true Christian who knows himself saved by faith in the Lamb of God and rejoices in the hope of glory, nothing is more certain than that all men are lost in sin and can be saved only through grace in Christ, and if some do not know this, though they may have great names in the less important domains of learning, that is their narrowness, not ours—a narrowness that is all the more to be deplored because the interests at stake are so broad.

Our admission, it will be perceived by all who think intelligently, pertains only to the correctness of the infidel argument within the narrow bounds of nature, to which infidelity is limited by its inherent narrowness. The great question of human destiny reaches far beyond that. How we can know anything more than our experiences on this earth teaches us, together with the inferences which our reason may draw from these experiences, may seem a very hard question to the Atheist or Deist or Naturalist or Rationalist or whatever the men who recognize no source of knowledge but nature and accept no light but that

which this reflects, and which by the common consent of all earnest students of nature is dim enough; but to those who are lifted higher and obtain a wider view by a special revelation given for our enlightenment in the mercy of Him who made and gave us all things and who pities us in the narrowness which sin has imposed, it is easy. God has given us light in Christ through grace. That is the great light that is designed for the enlightenment of all men and that shines in Holy Scripture to be known and read of all men. Of course, in our controversy with the unbelieving world, learned and unlearned, it is a question of principle. To the infidel we must seem narrow in our insistence on the truth given in the Bible, which only Christians recognize, as against the teachings of nature, which all men may reasonably be expected to accept. But this cannot in the least disconcert a Christian who is such in reality, and not merely in profession or pretense. He recognizes all the revelation of Himself which God has given in creation and providence, but all the more is moved to adore the wisdom and love which has supplied by a special revelation the light and the help without which the soul could find no rest in the toil and the turmoil of nature. The Christian knows of a Saviour of whom nature knows nothing. His alleged narrowness is the opening of a wide view into the future world and the prospect of glory beyond all temporal evolutions and revolutions. That is something which the wise men of the world as well as other people should find worth knowing, and they manifest as little wisdom in declaring our confession of Christ to be offensive narrowness as a Christian would in being frightened by the declaration, and in consequence becoming ashamed of Jesus.

In another respect also the men of science and philosophy who dig and delve in the mines of physics and metaphysics by the little light of nature, with a sneer at any Christian suggestion of a greater light furnished in the Bible, might have a larger vision and a deeper insight if they would rid themselves of the narrow prejudice that scorns the supernatural revelation and induces them to brand those who accept it with narrowness. Obviously all suggestions in this regard are especially offensive to infidel workers in the field of scientific investigations. This they claim as peculiarly their own domain, and they are always ready to resent all interference by theologians, who are assumed to be workers in an en-

tirely different domain. It has a reasonable appearance when these are admonished, sometimes in a not very gracious mood, to mind their own business and not to meddle with things which they do not understand. It is the old and ever recurring charge of narrowness. And alas! some Christians are scared by the conceit and the boldness and the sarcasm of infidels, and surrender the field when their paper wads begin to fly. Let rational creatures be reasonable. May not Christian people pry into the mysteries of nature, in matter and mind at least, as well as those who deny Christ and have no hopes beyond the transitory things of earth? Christians dishonor their profession when they concede everything to the infidel in regard to the constitution and powers and purpose of nature, as if Christianity were a disqualification for the understanding of these things. Even within the narrow range of natural revelation why should not a believer in Jesus see as clearly as an unbeliever? The concessions which Christians sometimes make to infidel science are shameful in the extreme. Nor is there any rational ground for the contention that is so frequently made by implication and sometimes expressly, that theologians have no calling and no voice in questions of science and philosophy. They are among the best scholars in physical and metaphysical science that the world has ever known, not only Christians, but all students in these departments of learning being the judges. And one thing more must be mentioned. With Christians who understand their high calling it is not a narrow question of relative truth, as between the truth of nature in its limited sphere and the truth of revelation that seems to many minds limited to another contracted sphere, but the broad question of everlasting truth in regard to the creature in general and man in particular. The fundamental point of difference is not between the reasoning of the scientist and the reasoning of the theologian. Both may err, and therefore it may be difficult to determine which is right or whether either is right; indeed, a candid critic might conclude that both are wrong. The essential question pertains to the source of knowledge and the principle involved where there is disharmony. Christians recognize and love the truth wherever they find it. They know and worship God. They believe in Him as the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth as well as the Son, Redeemer of the world, and the Holy Ghost who

applies the love of the Father and the redemption of the Son for our regeneration and salvation. They know what is revealed in nature as well as infidel scientists can know it, for they too are rational creatures. And they know Christ by a revelation which is not given in nature, and by the power of the Holy Spirit believe in Him and have eternal life. But thus they know a great deal more than nature teaches about God, about the creation, and about man as the chief of earthly creatures. If only students of nature were broader in their views and wiser, how much of the darkness that hangs over us would be dispelled and how the otherwise gloomy development of the earth under the power of sin would be enlightened! The infidel scientist does not know what the Christian believer knows about the destiny and the government of this world, and the infidel philosopher does not know what the Christian believer knows to explain the mystery of this painful earth. No wonder therefore that in physics and metaphysics the human mind flounders about in the mire of sin and produces materialistic and fatalistic and pantheistic theories that afford no hope. And yet we are accused of narrowness when we declare the Christian truth which brings light into this darkness!

In the second place, as regards the charge of narrowness of heart, or in all the elements and offices of love, we can afford to be brief. The charge is made against us Lutherans especially in this regard, and generally by people who profess to be Christians, though they are of a different confession and therefore of a different denomination. In the former case the charge of narrowness pertains to Christians in their relations to those who are unbelievers, in this case it pertains to Lutherans in their relations to other churches. As to this we might call to remembrance and urge upon those who will not accept the confession of the Lutheran Church, that the great Reformation of the sixteenth century was a result of a battle fought and a victory won on the same principle that now brings us into conflict with unbelievers. They charge us with narrowness because we cannot accept nature and reason as the final court of appeal, but must insist that God, who made all things, must be heard as to the purport and meaning of them all, and especially as to the design and destiny of man, when He speaks to us in a supernatural way by His Word. In the last analysis was not that the main point of controversy between

Luther and Rome, between the Evangelicals and the Papists? In one aspect of the case there was a question at stake of even higher import than this; it was that of man's salvation from sin and death, in comparison with which all other questions apparently dwindle into insignificance. They do so really in most cases; nay, they do so really in every case, with one exception. For if the soul is eternally lost, what gain can there be in a few spurts of pleasure, and if the soul is everlasting saved what loss can there be in a few twinges of pain? It is always pitiful nervousness to confine the immortal soul's view within the bounds of time. But how can we poor creatures, whose range of vision is so limited, see any further? God, who made all and governs all, has told us things about the world and its destiny, about man and his salvation, which we could not otherwise know. And the means of knowing this is the one exception to which we referred. The salvation in Christ is the glorious possession of Christian people, compared with which all the glittering gold of this world is dross—we may be permitted to use the stronger word, is dung. But the only way that we can know the mind of God and the merciful provision He has made for our salvation in the mission of His only begotten Son, and in pursuance of His gracious purposes in the mission of the Holy Ghost, is by the revelation which He has given us in the Scriptures. Hence against the reason of Rome, and the historic prestige which Rome had acquired on grounds of reasoning which never can rise above nature, Luther and the Lutherans appealed to the Word of God, and on that made their stand and won their victory. On that we still make our stand. Shall not our faith be the victory that overcomes the world?

And now the charge is made against us even by professed Christians that we Lutherans are narrow-hearted, though they do not always chime in with the railing accusation that we are narrow-minded in our insistence on the principle that there is a source of knowledge which is higher than that of nature, and which makes known to us what the revelations of nature do not contain and cannot teach.

What now shall we say to these things? We must not try to conceal that we are at a disadvantage in the controversy, because the prejudice and the passion of the community is against us. But we must not lose our heads

in the heat of the battle and imagine that the opponents are right because they are many.

The charge made against us, when closely examined, amounts to this, that we are lacking in love because we do not fall into line when natural humanitarianism gives the command. We distinguish, we discriminate, as our Lord requires. And that is what makes the trouble. When a tramp asks money, and we offer him work as a condition, whilst a neighbor gives him the money without asking the work, we of course in his estimation have less love. Our love is governed by a different principle and to some must appear narrow. When a secretist desires admission to the privileges of the church, and we ask him first to recognize the Lord Jesus as the only Saviour and to renounce the broad humanitarianism and religionism of the lodges, which reduces salvation to so narrow a compass in fact, whilst it widens it so much in fiction, but another church cordially welcomes him to its communion, it would be surprising if he and all his sympathizers did not, in their contracted view of the matter involved, pronounce us offensively narrow and the other church laudably broad and liberal. But when we gather and build up congregations with a view to bringing souls to the Saviour and to everlasting blessedness in His kingdom, which is not of this world, and are therefore directed only by His Word, in whose name we labor and—suffer, no strange thing happens to us. But when we require of all alike that they should accept Christ and His Word and submit themselves to His will as loyal subjects of the kingdom, railing accusations of narrowness are brought against us because we will yield nothing and abate nothing and relax nothing which the Master has fixed and not left to our judgment or sentiment or will, though others equally claiming to be Christians yield many things and sometimes everything, with a view to capturing the crowd and winning the plaudit of breadth of thought and catholicity of feeling. "Alas for the rarity of *Christian* charity under the sun!" When Christians are lifted to the higher plane of revelation and seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, therefore rejecting all the claims and pretensions of carnal sentiment, as well as the claims and pretensions of carnal reason, which presume to assert themselves against the will of the Lord, they must needs seem narrow to those who naturally recognize no grounds for such restrictions as the Scriptures

place upon us, and as true believers accept because the grace of God has made them believers. There is a difference of principle that is fundamental, and there is no hope of settling the disagreement arising from this difference except by going back to the foundations as they are presented in the supernatural revelation given in the Scriptures as distinguished from any and every natural revelation given in nature and in reason, in matter and in mind. Our thought must seem narrow to the naturalist and rationalist when it takes knowledge into account, which their science and their philosophy has not discovered, our love must seem narrow to the sentimentalists, whose kindly feeling would please everybody in the wide range of our common humanity, when it takes the eternal interests of man into account, for which the flesh has no sympathy.

Whether therefore the charge of narrowness pertains to our head or our heart, it always resolves itself in the end to a fundamental difference of principle. Christians and infidels cannot agree, whatever the concessions that are made by one or the other, because they have not the same standard to regulate their judgment. And when Christians, who in common oppose the infidelity that rejects the Scriptures, differ among themselves, is it not the same fundamental question that divides them, whether the Word of God shall decide or whether human reason and human sentiment shall not have a voice in the decision, and accordingly whether the will of man shall not have something to say as well as the will of God? In our insistence that the will of God alone governs the universe, that in the merciful provision which He has made in Christ for the salvation of the world our narrow thinking and feeling has no vote and no right of revision, and that any attempt to subvert or modify the way of salvation, as revealed in the Scriptures, is absolute folly, we cannot escape the charge of narrowness. To those who know not the truth in Christ, or those who know it imperfectly and dream of a reconciliation between nature and grace in regard to the soul's salvation, all persistence in the exclusive claims of the Gospel of Christ must seem to ignore the revelations of science and the natural impulses of the heart, and thus to subject itself to the charge of narrowness. And many are scared by this. How this thing works is seen in the many concessions that are made to infidels, even by Christians. Why, what is there any

more that is certain in some of our American churches? The enemy is laying the axe to the root of the tree, and not only particular doctrines of the Reformation, but the central doctrine of all Christianity, that Christ alone is the Saviour of the world, and the organic foundation on which all our knowledge of salvation rests, are assailed. The only Name is questioned and the reliability and authority of Holy Scripture is denied; and only nature and reason are left to guide us. Alas, that so many are scared by the stupid charges of narrowness hurled at us Christians and are ready to conciliate the foe by yielding one point after another until there is nothing worth contending about and the narrow path is merged into the broad road that leads to destruction.

THE LEAGUE STATUS IN THE CHURCH.

BY REV. E. CRONENWETT, A. M., BUTLER, PA.

III.

The base of operation of the Luther League Societies is not without but within the Church: "In the Church, for the Church, with the Church." What place in the divine economy of the visible fold shall they occupy? Answers will differ according to varying conceptions of the Church, its organism and office. It may therefore not be amiss to devote some space to the consideration of this subject.

1) THE CHURCH AND ITS OFFICE.

To the Church of Christ are committed the Oracles of God. A spiritual temple, built up of lively stones, it has Christ as its Foundation and Founder. In organization and endowments it is evidently planned in answer to divine purpose. In relation to God and toward man, as to essential, spiritual being and organized public capacity, it bears a twofold aspect. As body of believers in Christ, the fold of the Great Shepherd is the "communion of saints," the mystical body of Christ, the bride of the Lamb; and, — functionally, — the elect handmaid of the Lord, the spiritual mother of God's children, the institution of salvation. Through the immanence of the Holy Spirit, it in the Office of the Keys, the Word and Sacraments, has plentitude of

power and means efficient, as embodiment of the kingdom of grace, for its saving mission. Called to be the salt of the earth, the leaven of new life from on high, the light of the world, its living membership is "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (Rev. Ver.) — that they should show forth the excellencies of Him who called them out of darkness into His marvellous light. 1 Pet. 2, 9. Through the indwelling Word — the habitation of God through the Spirit—the Church in its institutional integrity is the house, the City of God — the pillar and ground of the Truth. Ps. 87, 3; 1 Tim. 3, 15.

This "one holy Church is to continue forever," and summarily, "is the congregation of saints (the assembly of all believers), in which the Gospel is rightly taught (purely preached), and the Sacraments are administered (according to the Gospel)." Augsb. Conf., Art. VII. — "(Namely, where God's Word is pure, and the Sacraments are administered in conformity with the same, there certainly is the Church, and there are Christians)." Apol., Chap. IV.

With respect to its institutional character, the Church is equipped with a corporate public office that faith may come by hearing. Rom. 10. "For the obtaining of this faith, the ministry of teaching the Gospel, and administering the Sacraments was instituted. For by the Word and Sacraments, as by instruments, the Holy Spirit is given." Augsb. Conf., Art. V.

The Church universal, the sum total of all saints through faith incorporated in Christ, "alone is called the body of Christ; because Christ renews, (Christ is its Head and) sanctifies and governs it by His Spirit, as Paul testifies (Ephes. 1, 22 sq.), when he says: 'and gave Him to be Head over all things to the Church,' which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." However, the Church universal, *in its institutional capacity, manifests itself in epitome as local congregation of saints, autonomously organized in the fellowship of the Gospel as Pastor and flock.* In this direction Luther says: "But Christian Church denotes the number or mass of baptized or believers who belong to a pastor or bishop, be it in a city, or in an entire country, or in the whole world." (Proposition which Martin Luther will uphold against the entire school of Satan). Erl. Vol. 31, p. 123, A. D. 1530. "Therein no other or stranger, without his (the pastor's) will and consent, shall dare presume to teach his parishioners, neither secretly nor openly, and none either, under peril of body and

soul, shall listen to such an one" — "Nor will it avail them aught to claim: *'All Christians are priests.'* True, all Christians *are priests*, but they are *not all pastors*. For in addition to this that one is a Christian and priest he must also have an office and parish committed to him." Erl. Vol. 39, p. 254-5, A. D. 1530. "For the pastor has (as all know) charge of the chair of teaching, Baptism, Sacrament, and all care of souls is commanded him." Erl. Vol. 31, p. 214, A. D. 1531. Teachers and hearers, (pastor and parishioner) are the constitutive factors in the tangible organization of the Church visible. *Acts 13, 1; Phil. 1, 1; James 3, 1.*

Such divine appointment and order St. Paul emphasizes in his charge to the *elders* of Ephesus, saying: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." *Acts 20, 28.* St. Peter writes in similar strain to the *bishops* of the congregations "scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia," saying: "The *elders* which are among you I exhort who am also an *elder*, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, — Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind." *1 Pet. 5, 1; 5, 1, 2.* On the other hand the admonition to the *laity* reads: "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." *1 Thess. 5, 12.* As also: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you." *Heb. 13, 17.* And *1 Tim. 5, 17*: "Let the *elders* that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the Word and doctrine."

The *Holy Spirit* in His messages to the seven Churches of Asia Minor, addressed to the *bishops* of the respective Churches, recognizes His own established order and relation in the Church of pastor and flock and thereby shows that official spiritual supervision and responsibility pertains to the Church of the New Covenant as it did to the Old. "O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the Word at my mouth, and warn them from me." *Ezek. 33, 7.* In *Revelations* therefore we read: "The seven stars are the seven *angels* (bishops) of

the seven Churches ; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven *Churches*. Unto the *angel of the Church* of Ephesus write : ‘These things saith He that holdeth the seven stars in His right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks : I know thy works and thy labor and thy patience — nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent ; or else I will come unto thee quickly and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.’ . . . He that hath an ear, let him hear what the *Spirit saith unto the Churches*.’ Rev. 1, 20 ; chap. 2 and 3.

The student of history will note with interest how the Church of the sub-apostolic age and along the early centuries of the Christian era sought to preserve the unity of the fold intact in one true faith and buildup it through the faithful ministrations of, respect for and adherence to the Church’s public office.

Ignatius of Antioch (d. A. D. 110) in his “Epistle to the Ephesians” writes : “But, since love doth not suffer me to be silent concerning you, therefore was I forward to exhort you, that ye run in *harmony with the mind of God*; for Jesus Christ also, our inseparable life, is *in the mind of the Father*, even as *the bishops* that are settled in the *farthest parts* of the earth are *in the mind of Jesus Christ*. So then it becometh you to run in *harmony with the mind of the bishop*; which thing also ye do, for your honorable presbytery which is worthy of God, *is attuned to the bishop, even as its strings to a lyre*. Therefore in *your concord and harmonious love Jesus Christ is sung*. And do ye, each and all, form yourselves into a chorus, that being harmonious in concord and taking the *keynote of God* ye may *in unison sing* with one voice through Jesus Christ unto the Father, that He may both hear you and acknowledge you by your good deeds to be *members of His Son*. It is therefore profitable for you to be *in blameless unity*, that ye may also be *partakers of God always*.” (Lightfoot, Apostol. Fathers, Part II, Vol. II, p. 544).

“Ep. to the Magnesians” : “Therefore as the Lord did nothing without the Father, (being united with Him) either by Himself or by the Apostles, so neither do ye anything without *the bishop and the presbyters*. And attempt not to think anything *right for yourselves apart from others*; but let there be one *prayer in common, one supplication, one mind, one hope, in love and in joy unblamable, which is Jesus Christ, than whom there is nothing better*. Hasten

to come together all of you, as to one temple, even God: as to one altar, even to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from One Father and is One and departed unto One.—Do your diligence therefore that ye be confirmed *in the ordinances of the Lord and of the apostles*, that ye may prosper in all things whatsoever ye do in flesh and in spirit, by faith and by love, in the Son and Father and in the Spirit, in the beginning and in the end, *with your reverend bishop, and with the fitly wreathed spiritual circlet of your presbytery, and with the deacons who walk after God*. Be obedient to the bishop and to one another, as Jesus Christ was to the Father (according to the flesh), and as the Apostles were to Christ and to the Father, that there may be union both of flesh and of spirit.” Ibid, pp. 552-3.

“Ep. to the Trallians”: “In like manner let all men respect the deacons as Jesus Christ, even as they should respect the bishop as being a type of the Father and the presbyters as the council of God and as the college of Apostles. *Apart from these there is not even the name of a Church.*” Ibid, p. 555.

“Epistle to the Philadelphians”: “Abstain from noxious herbs, which are not the husbandry of Jesus Christ, because they are not the planting of the Father. Not that I have found division among you, but filtering. *For as many as are of God and of Jesus Christ, they are with the bishop; and as many as shall repent and enter into the unity of the Church, these also shall be of God, that they may be living after Jesus Christ.* Be not deceived, my brethren. If any man followeth one that maketh schism, he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. If any man walketh in *strange doctrine*, he hath no fellowship *with the passion.*” Ibid, p. 564.

“Ep. to the Smyrnians”: “Shun divisions as the beginning of evils. Do ye all follow your bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and the presbytery as the Apostles; and to the Deacons pay respect, as to God’s commandment. *Let no man do aught of things pertaining to the Church apart from the bishop.* Let that be held a valid eucharist which is under the bishop of one to whom he shall have committed it.” Ibid, p. 569.

“Ep. to Polycarp”: “Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto Polycarp who is bishop of the Church of the Smyrnians or rather *who has for his bishop God the Father and Jesus Christ*, abundant greeting. — Give ye heed to the bishop, that God also may give heed to you. *I am devoted to those who are subject to the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons.* May it be granted me to have my portion with

them in the presence of God. Toil together one with another, struggle together, run together, as God's stewards and assessors and ministers. Please the Captain in whose army ye serve, from whom also ye will receive your pay. Let none of you be found a deserter." *Ibid*, pp. 571-3.

Irenaeus, (b. in the Province of Asia about A. D. 115, d. somewhat after A. D. 190, perhaps as late as A. D. 202), at first Deacon, then successor to Pothinus in the Bishopric at Lyons, a Greek Colony in Gaul, (France), in his book "Against Heretics", gives us views that reflect primitive Greek Christianity. He uses the argument, of an uncorrupt doctrinal continuity in unbroken ministerial succession in the Churches of the Apostles up to his day, as proof of *Church identity* over against the heretics, as late-comers, and in refutation of their new inventions. Irenaeus himself could trace his episcopal succession through Pothinus and Polycarp, whom he saw in his youth, to St. John, the Apostle. But *his argument is for the Church associated with a regular ministry in the true faith*. "*The assembling of ourselves together* with the *Church's legitimate ministry, in the confession, transmission, defence of the faith, once delivered to the saints, is to him not a matter of no moment*. Irenaeus says:

"I shall adduce proofs from the Scriptures, so that I may come behind in nothing of what thou hast enjoined. — Call to mind, then, the things which I have stated in the two preceding books, and, taking these in connection with them, thou shalt have from me a very copious refutation of all the heretics; and faithfully and strenuously shalt thou resist them *in defence of the only true and life-giving faith, which the Church has received from the Apostles and imparted to her sons*. For the *Lord of all gave to His Apostles the power of the Gospel*, through whom also we have known the truth, that is, the doctrine of the Son of God; to whom also did the Lord declare: 'He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me, and Him that sent Me.' We have learned *from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the Gospel has come down to us*, which they did at one time *proclaim in public*, and, at a later period, *by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith*. — When, however, they (the heretics) are confuted from the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures, as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and (assert) that they are *ambiguous*, and that the truth cannot be extracted from them by those who are *ignorant of*

tradition, for (they allege) that the truth was not delivered by means of written documents, but *viva voce*: wherefore also Paul declared, 'But we speak wisdom among those that are perfect, but not the wisdom of this world.' — But, again, when we refer them to *that tradition which originates from the Apostles, (and) which is preserved by means of the succession of presbyters in the Churches*, they object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the Apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth. — It is within the power of all, therefore, in every Church, who may wish to see the truth, *to contemplate clearly the tradition of the Apostles manifested throughout the whole world*; and we are in a position to reckon up those who were by the Apostles instituted bishops in the Churches, and (to demonstrate) the *succession of these men to our own times*; those who neither taught nor knew anything like *what these (heretics) rave about*. For if the Apostles had known hidden mysteries, which they were in the habit of imparting to the 'perfect' apart and privily from the rest, they would have delivered them especially *to those to whom they were also committing the Churches themselves*. For they were desirous that these men should be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom also they were leaving behind as their successors, delivering up *their own place of government to these men*; which men, if they discharged their functions honestly, would be a great boon (to the Church), but if they should fall away, the direst calamity. — Since, therefore, the tradition from the Apostles does thus exist in the Church, and is permanent among us, let us revert to the Scriptural proof furnished by *those Apostles who did also write the Gospel*, pointing out that our Lord Jesus Christ is the truth, and that no lie is in Him." Book III, pp. 414 ssq.

"Wherefore it is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church, — those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the Apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But it is also incumbent to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, (looking upon them) either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory. For all these have fallen from the truth. — Such presbyters does the Church nourish, of whom also the prophet says: 'I will give thy rulers in

peace, and thy bishops in righteousness.' Of whom also did the Lord declare: 'Who then shall be a faithful steward (*actor*), good and wise, to give them their meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when He cometh, shall find so doing.' Paul then, teaching us *where one may find such*, says, 'God hath placed in the Church, first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers.' *Where, therefore, the gifts of the Lord have been placed, there it behooves us to learn the truth*, (namely) from those who possess that *succession of the Church which is from the Apostles*, and among whom exists that which is sound and blameless in conduct, as well as that which is unadulterated and incorrupt in speech. For these also preserve this faith of ours in one God who created all things; and they increase that love (which we have) for the Son of God, who accomplished such marvellous dispensations for our sake: and they expound the Scriptures to us without danger, neither blaspheming God, nor dishonoring the patriarchs, nor despising the prophets." Book IV, p. 497. *Ibid.* — It is evident, that Irenaeus attaches importance to *respect for and conformity with divine Church appointments*.

St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, (from A. D. 248 up to his martyrdom in 258), gives us a glimpse of the *collegiate form* of Church government in vogue in North Africa in his day. From his temporary retreat he, in reply to a communication, writes to his "co-presbyters": "In respect of that which our fellow-presbyters, Donatus and Fortunatus, Novatus and Gordius, wrote to me, I have not been able to reply *by myself*, since, from the first commencement of my episcopacy, I made up my mind *to do nothing on my own private opinion, without your advice and without the consent of the people*. But as soon, as by the grace of God, I shall have come to you, then *we will discuss in common*, as our respective dignity requires, those things which either have been or are to be done." Ep. 5 Ant. Nic. Lib., Vol. V., p. 283. Chris. Lit. Co.

There is a canon of the old Carthaginian Church, which shows the official distinction between the presiding Bishop and his Presbyters to have been rather a matter of public order and decorum. — Canon 35, of a collection hailing from about the end of the fifth century, says: "At Church and in the assembly of Presbyters the Bishop shall have an elevated seat, but at home he must consider himself a colleague of the Presbyters." *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua.**

* Mansi T. III. Col. 946-967.

"Wherefore, the Church can never be governed and preserved better, than if we all live under one Head, Christ, and all the bishops, equal in office (although they be unequal in gifts), be diligently joined in the unity of doctrine, faith, sacraments, prayer and works of love, etc., just as St. Jerome writes that the priests at Alexandria together and in common governed the Churches, as did also the Apostles, and afterwards all bishops throughout all Christendom, until the Pope raised his head above all." Smalc. Art., Part II, Art. 4.

The general care of the Church, by presbyters in common, under a presiding elder, primarily more locally, resulted next in provincial synods and finally, under imperial protection, in ecumenical councils. The earliest of which at Nicea, A. D. 325, illustrious because of its creed of the same name, reaffirmed or further applied various principles of Church polity of prior acknowledgement and standing. Attention is called to the following:

HANDS SUDDENLY ARE TO BE LAID ON NO MAN. 1 Tim. 5, 22.

Canon 2. "Because many things have been done contrary to Church Rule, insomuch that some men have lately been proselyted to the faith from a heathen course of life, and having for a while been catechumens have presently been baptized, and thereupon been preferred to be bishops, or priests; It is decreed that nothing of the sort be done for the future; for a man should stay a catechumen for some time, and after baptism be fully proved; for the Apostolic decree is clear: 'Not a neophyte, lest being puffed up, he fall into condemnation and the snare of the devil,' — and if any after a long time be convicted of any sensual sin, let him be dismissed from the clergy. (The Bishop) that does otherwise, shall do it at the peril of his Orders, as one that dare oppose the great Synod."

OFFICIAL CONSENSUS, PUBLICITY AND ORDER IN THE APPOINTMENT OF BISHOPS.

Canon 4. "A Bishop ought to be constituted of all the Bishops that belong to the province; but if this be not practicable, either through pressing necessity, or the length of the journey, three must by all means meet; and when they have the consent of those that are absent, signified by letter, then let them perform the consecration; and the ratification of what is done must be allowed in each Province to the Metropolitan."

UNIVERSAL FORCE OF LEGITIMATE OFFICIAL ACTION, BUT
EPISCOPAL ACTS SUBJECT TO SYNODICAL REVIEW.

Canon 5. "Let sentence according to Canon prevail, that clergymen or laymen, being excommunicated by some, be not received by others; and let examination be made whether any have been excommunicated by the captiousness or party spirit, or any such like unpleasantness of the Bishop. And that this inquiry be duly made, it seems good that two Synods should be held in the year; that such questions may be entered into at an assembly of all the Bishops, so that those who have confessedly offended against the Bishop may appear excommunicated by them all; until by the same authority a more lenient sentence is passed upon them. Let one Synod be held before Lent, that so, all animosity being removed, the pure Gift may be offered to God; the other about autumn."

ORIGINAL PARITY OF PRIVILEGES DEFENDED TO THE
VARIOUS CHURCH PROVINCES.

Canon 6. "Let the ancient customs prevail, namely, those in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over all these, since the same is customary for the Bishop of Rome. Likewise, in Antioch and other provinces, let the privilege be secured to the Churches. This is manifest as anything at all, that if any be made a Bishop, without consent of his Metropolitan, this great Synod has determined, that such a one ought not to be Bishop. If any two or three, out of affection of dispute, do contradict the suffrage of the generality, when duly passed according to Ecclesiastical Canon, let the vote of the majority prevail."

Luther's provision for Church visitation, embodied in his "Instruction of the Visitators to the Pastors in the Principality of Duke Henry of Saxony", (A. D. 1528 and 1538) adopted in modified form supervisory features of the episcopacy of the primitive Church. In the absence of organic union and general synodical government, he accepted the situation of the Church at large of each principality under the protectorate of Christian civil rulers — especially as to correction of that in pulpit or pew which bore on civil disorder, and put it in this wise: "*Of the Order of Superintendent.*"

"This Pastor shall be Superintendent of all other clergy situate in the jurisdiction or precincts of the place, whether they dwell among the monasteries, chapters, etc., (be it)

those of the nobility or others; and shall exercise diligent supervision, that teaching in the parishes referred to be right and Christian and the Word of God and the Gospel be purely and faithfully preached, and the people be blessedly provided with the holy Sacrament according to the institution of Christ, likewise (shall he see to it) that they (the clergy) lead a good life, so that the common people may improve and take no offence, and that they do not preach or teach contrary to the Word of God or as may foment insurrection against the government. Should now one or more such things be heard of or done by one or more pastors or preachers, then shall aforesaid Superintendent summon him or them to him, and insist that he abstain therefrom, and in kindness show him wherein he did amiss, erred, — by too little or too much, whether in doctrine or life. Should he however, not cease, nor be disposed to desist, and especially not from incitement to false doctrine and riot, then shall the Superintendent forthwith notify the Judiciary, who shall report the fact to our gracious lord (Duke Henry), that his princely grace may in time take proper recourse in the matter." Erl., Vol. 23, p. 63.

Barring hierarchical pretensions and the figment of an "historic Episcopate," Luther did teach *official succession* in the pastoral office of the Church, and that the office of the Word permanently continues in the Church from the beginning, — without however ascribing any special unction, extraneous to the Word, to the person of the incumbents. In connection with his definition of the *call*, on which Luther *strenuously insists*, he says:

"Therefore the call that is divine and right takes place in a twofold manner: firstly through means; then without means. For in our times our Lord God calls us to the office of preaching through means, namely through men. The Apostles however were called without means by Christ Himself; even as the Prophets in the Old Testament are called without means by God Himself. *Thereafter the Apostles called their disciples, as St. Paul his Timothy and Titus, etc., who afterwards further called the bishops (as is written Tit. 1, 5).* The bishops however called their successors, thus on and on, up to our times, and thus it will likely have to remain and be observed till to the end of the world. And this is the call that takes place through means, and is even nevertheless a divine call." Commentary on Gal. 1, 1. "When Judas went to the devil, he did not take his bishopric with him, but left it behind him, and Matthias got it in his place. The offices and Sacraments ever remain in the Church, the

persons change daily. Only let those be called and placed therein who can execute them, then will they go and work without fail. The steed is bridled and saddled, place upon it but a naked lad who can ride, and the steed will go just as well as though Emperor or Pope rode it." Erl., Vol. 31, p. 362-3. "The offices must always have been in the Church from the beginning, and remain unto the end. But other persons must continually be placed therein, as Matthias after Judas (Acts 1, 26), and living bishops after the deceased." Erl., Vol. 25, p. 300. "Have now the Apostles, Evangelists and Prophets ceased, then must others have come in their place, and still come till to the end of the world. For the Church shall not cease till to the end of the world, therefore must Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets remain, be they called even how they will or can, who attend to God's Word and work." Ibid, p. 366. St. Paul teaches: "That the authority of the ministry depends upon the Word of God, . . . that the office of the ministry proceeds from the general call of the Apostles." Smalc. Art. App., p. 340. — "But no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God." Heb. 5, 4.

Wherefore, — "Concerning Ecclesiastical Orders (Church Government), they (the Churches among us), teach, that no man should publicly in the Church teach, or administer the Sacraments, except he be rightly called (without a regular call.)" Augsb. Conf., Art. XIV.

"True it is, however, that the Holy Ghost has in this matter *excepted women, children and incompetent persons*, but elects thereto *competent men only* (need excepted), as we now and again read this in St. Paul's Epistles, that a bishop shall be apt to teach, blameless, the husband of one wife, 1 Tim. 3, 2, and 1 Cor. 14, 34: Woman shall not teach in the assembly; in brief, it shall be *an apt select man*, for which children, women and other persons are disqualified, although they are competent to hear the Word of God, to receive Baptism, Sacrament, and likewise be true, holy Christians, as St. Peter (1 Ep. 3, 7) says. For even nature and God's creation makes such distinction that women (much less children or fools) cannot nor shall have rule, as experience teaches, and Moses, Gen. 3, 16 says: Thou shalt be subject to man. The Gospel, however, does not abrogate such natural law, but confirms it as God's order and creation." Erl. 25, p. 364-5.

But even superior, scholarly Christian men are not on that score authorized at pleasure to assume the prerogative of public teaching in the Church. "Are all apostles? Are

all prophets? Are all teachers?" Evidently *just as little as* eminent citizens are *state officials* unless they are *elected to office*. Similarly — "*The vocation and command makes a pastor and preacher*; just as a citizen or layman may be learned, but is not, therefore, a doctor, authorized to lecture publicly in the schools, or take upon himself such office *without being called*." Luther, Erl. 39, p. 255. "*For if the call and command were not insisted on, there would at last be no more Church*: because just as the sneaks come among us, and strive to divide and destroy our Church, so would other sneaks afterward come into their churches and divide and destroy them; and thus the sneaking and dividing would continue without end, or until there would be nothing left of any Church. This is what the devil designs and strives to compass through such schismatic spirits and sneaks. Therefore our decision must be: either *show your call* and command to preach, or *keep silence*, and presume not to preach. *For here an office is in question, yea, an office of preaching. But an office no one can have without a command and call.*" Luther, Erl., Vol. 31, p. 218.

In this matter and the principle of Church Government involved, our older theologians are one with Luther. Chemnitz says: "We are indeed all spiritual priests, but *not all preachers*; for Paul explicitly writes: They are not all apostles, not all prophets, not all teachers, can not all interpret, etc., but God has given, some apostles; some prophets; some evangelists; some pastors and teachers, to edify the body of Christ, 1. Cor. 12; Eph. 4. And Peter aptly expresses himself, *not that we all without vocation should presumptuously assume the office of the ministry*, but we are all priests, that we should offer up spiritual sacrifices." Rom. 12; Heb. 13. Enchir., p. 14. And Gerhard says: "Neither is there any force in the objection that Peter adds, concerning the pious believers, 'Ye are a royal priesthood, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you to His marvellous light.' For we must distinguish between the general command and vocation which all the pious receive when they are made Christians, and in virtue of which it is required of them to declare the praises of God, by whom they are called into communion with the Church, to confess Him in word and work, privately to instruct their families in true piety, Deut. 6, 20, to see that the Word of Christ dwells among them richly in all wisdom, and that they teach and admonish one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, Eph. 5, 10; Col. 3, 16, and to comfort one another with the Word of God, 1 Thess. 4, 18, etc., and the special vocation, by

which the administration of the Word and Sacraments, in the public assembly of the Church, is committed by the Church's public consent, to certain persons, which vocation is not common to all Christians, as is manifest from 1 Cor. 12, 29; Eph. 4, 11; James 3, 7." Loc. 24, § 67.

Among other reasons for the importance of the regular call, Chemnitz first adduces this: "Because God Himself through the Gospel ministry desires to deal with us, speak, absolve, baptize, Luke 1.; Heb. 1, 1; John 1; 2 Cor. 2, 5 and 13; therefore must indeed both the preacher and the Church have certain assurance of this, *that God would use just this person as such means and instrument.* But such assurance the regular call gives and brings, and then can each upright preacher refer to himself these texts of Scripture: 2 Cor. 5: God hath committed unto us the Word of reconciliation; as also: We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, etc. Isa. 59: My Words I have put in thy mouth. Matt. 10: He that heareth you, heareth me."

"In the second place, very many necessary gifts are requisite for the office of the ministry, so that even Paul says: *Who is sufficient for these things?* 2 Cor. 5. He who is regularly called by God to this office, this one can confidently take to himself the promises of God, on (the strength of) them pray, hope and trust, that God will in grace supply him with such gifts, 1 Tim. 4; 2 Tim. 1; fit him for the office, 2 Cor. 3; 2 Tim. 2; guide and protect him in such calling, Isa. 49, 51.

"Thirdly, in the office of the ministry *this is chief, that with His Spirit, grace and gifts, God will be with it, will through it be efficient and work.* Paul, however, Rom. 10, says they who are not sent, these can not in such manner preach, that faith will come by hearing. But they who in regular vocation present the doctrine pure and with planting and watering mean it faithfully with the office, — there will God give the increase, 1 Cor. 3, that the labor shall not be in vain in the Lord, 2 Cor. 15, but Timothy will thus save himself and others. 1 Tim. 4.

"Fourthly, The doctrine of the call *encourages* a preacher, that he in all fear of God with great diligence, fidelity and seriousness *wait upon his ministry*, grow not soon weary, also suffer himself not to be deterred by fear and persecution, because he knows, God has placed him into this office. In consideration of this ground the hearers are also moved, that they conduct themselves with becoming rever-

ence and obedience toward the ministry, when they are taught from the Word of God, that through such ministry God Himself is with us, and will act with and through us.” Enchir., p. 15.

Luther: “Therefore we are not to consider the call an indifferent matter, even though we have the pure and unadulterated Word of God and right doctrine, but we must likewise be certain of the call, that this is right. For he who breaks in uncalled of his own accord, this one certainly comes for no other purpose, than that he intends but to ravage and destroy. And our Lord will nevermore give sanction, success and blessing to those teachers, who rise of their own accord without regular call and command. And though they even at times bring something good and right to market, yet they thereby effect neither help nor counsel. — Therefore is this our comfort, who now at this time are in the ministerial office, that we in truth have a holy and heavenly office, thereto in a regular manner and rightly called, which we may well also boast against the gates of hell. On the other hand, it is a fearfully grave and terrible thing, when conscience says thus: O Lord God, what hast Thou here done, this and this hast Thou done without call and command. Then there begins such terror and tribulation in conscience, that such an uncalled preacher might well wish, that in his whole lifetime he had never heard or read that which he teaches. For *disobedience makes all works bad*, be they otherwise in themselves, as good as they ever will; so that even the very greatest and best works turn to become the very greatest and gravest sins.” *Com. on Gal. 1, 1*, p. 43.

Foregoing consideration of the Church and its office, including the call, has been hammered perhaps more than sufficiently broad; familiar citations have been included which have hitherto often enough been quoted, but such presentation anew is called for and germane to the subject matter under review. *The application should not be difficult*. In view of the divinely organized institutional character of the Church, as fully equipped and officered autonomous congregational body of God’s people, what call is there for indiscriminate interdenominational or intersynodical junior religious societies of a doctrinal trend — at large in the Church — as such virtually exempt from Church supervision and control? What divine call and command can be shown in justification of such independentistic movement? These are pertinent questions and seek answer. Such tendencies of the day are scarcely prompted by an *Ignatian* spirit: “Be at one with the bishop and the presbyters who are with him, and

with the deacons that have been appointed according to the mind of Christ, whom after His own will He confirmed and established by His Holy Spirit. . . . As children therefore (of the light) of the truth, shun division and wrong doctrine; and where the shepherd is, there follow ye as sheep. . . . Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal Church. It is not lawful to do anything apart from the bishop either to baptize or to hold a love-feast; but whatsoever he shall approve, this is well-pleasing also to God; that everything which ye do may be sure and valid." Lightfoot Apos. Fath., P. II, Vol. II, pp. 563 and 569.

The scheme of the Luther League at large will not fit into the Lutheran conception of the Scriptural doctrine of Church and Office. Local societies in the Church, as orderly sub-departments of the congregation subject to the congregation and under pastoral supervision and guidance, stand on a different plane; yet must they, not to prove the intrusion of an element foreign to the Church's spirit, polity and peace, be wisely safeguarded.

B. *Young People's Societies, their Use and Abuse.*

On this subject the Rev. F. F. Fry, in an address to the Luther League Convention of Pennsylvania, at Reading, Pa., June 25, 1895, strongly advocating the Luther League, gave on the whole a fair delineation rather favorable to local societies in the Church, palliating their foibles and representing them at their best. As reported in the Luther League Review of July of said year the speaker, in part, said:

"If the question be raised, what is the special use of these Young People's Societies? I answer, it is primarily, a *religious* use. I am well aware that this is not always strictly observed. But it dare not be wholly ignored. The hero whose name we bear was pre-eminently a religious reformer. The confession which we have adopted as our basis is strictly a religious confession. The Church for whose welfare we labor is essentially a religious institution. We dare not cultivate the brain and feelings at the expense of the heart and the soul. We have a prescribed form for the opening and closing of the Luther League meeting which is thoroughly religious. The Luther League Topics are based on the Scriptures, and are certainly religious. Any attempt to ignore this central feature is a weakening to be deplored.

"But along with the religious use, their use is also *educational*. It is to instruct the young people in the Bible and the doctrines of the Church. It is to develop their mental faculties and equip them for a higher sphere of usefulness. It is to train our young people to become efficient Sunday School superintendents and officers and teachers, capable members of our Church councils and governing boards. What we need to-day is not more Christians so much as more intelligent, more thoroughly educated Christians, who can withstand the subtle attacks of skepticism and infidelity and give a reason of the hope that is in them. If our young people are to become an efficient agency in the Church they must first be instructed. We want to bring to the front our lay talent, and that is one of the uses of our Young People's Societies."

"Nor dare we forget the *social* use. Our young people need to become better acquainted with each other. Every year thousands of them are confirmed at our altars. A large proportion of the membership of every congregation consists of young people. They need to be fitted and trained for active service. Some of them are awkward and ill at ease in the society of others. They hardly know what to say or how to act, and often make mortifying mistakes. They need to have the rough edges smoothed, to enjoy a greater measure of social culture. And this want our Young People's Societies can supply.

"So far as the pastor is concerned, he can put them to a very practical use. He is to plan methods and suggest lines of Christian service which they are to carry out. He is to stimulate their energy, to adjust work to worker and worker to work. He is to unite them to co-operative labor. His aim should be to allot to each member some specific and individual work. He is to work through workers. The best way to enlist the active interest and secure the hearty co-operation of others is by giving each individual something to do. Make them feel that they count for something, that a certain measure of responsibility rests upon them. We do not have sufficient confidence in our young people. Give them a fair chance and they will respond nobly. O, did we but realize it, every pastor here might become a very Briareus, having a hundred arms, through his young people! Just what particular method to pursue must be learned by experience. Methods vary in different places and even in the same place at different times. In the congregation of which I have the honor

to be pastor we have no less than four distinct Young People's Societies, which serve as four links in a chain. As soon as a child is promoted from the primary to the main department of a Sunday School, which is often an important period of life, she enters the Gleaners—a junior Luther League—and remains there until fourteen years of age. Then she is advanced to the Loyal League and continues there until confirmation. At confirmation, when hundreds of young people are practically lost to the Church, so far as active service is concerned, the young men enter the Luther Union and the young women the Grace Guild. As a direct result nearly every young person in the entire congregation is actively identified with one of these organizations. As the unifying head of all stands the pastor."

"In addition to making a special effort to attend all our services, whether in the Church or the Sunday School or the mid-week services, they visit every member of the Congregation and report special cases to the pastor. They are attentive to the sick and endeavor to call on them once in every two weeks during their illness. They are an important factor in the work of benevolence, not only feeding and clothing the destitute in our own town, but sending annually boxes to the orphans and to our home and foreign missionaries. They contribute materially to the finances of the congregation, raising last year in a legitimate way the surprising sum of \$1,400. But, above all, they seek to win others, to save souls, to welcome strangers, to interest and care for those who feel neglected and discouraged and in every proper way to advance the cause of Christ and His Church.

"Shall any one question the value of such organizations? Shall we count such work as all for naught? I regard the Luther League as a veritable benediction to our people. It has served to increase our membership, to stimulate the careless and indifferent and to make us more aggressive and progressive in the work of the Master. But, sad to tell, along with the proper use of these societies there is coupled a corresponding *abuse*. Every useful thing in the world can be abused and often is abused. Because they are abused does not prove that they cannot be rightly used, but just the reverse. Counterfeits do not prove that there is no genuine money in circulation, but precisely the opposite. Some people so magnify the abuse that they forget the use. The most prevalent abuse of our Young People's Societies is the con-

stant and morbid desire for some form of entertainment. That seems to be the magnetic force which draws and holds them together. They are so anxious to counteract the attractions of the world that they adopt the same methods as those which the world uses. The only difference is that they are stamped with another name, wear a different costume and perhaps are held in the basement of the Church. But they are subtle snares that lead the soul away from Christ, rather than helps to bring it into abiding union with Him.

"Our chief aim should be to bring our young people closer to Christ. Make them conscious of their personal relation to the Savior. Teach them what religion really is, who they are, where they are and whither they are going. May we so use our Young People's Societies as not to abuse them. May our motto be Forward, Onward, Upward! So shall the Luther League accomplish its glorious mission and realize that which it was intended to be, an important aid to the work of Christ and His Church."

Rev. G. H. T(rabert, D. D.), in a communication to *The Lutheran* of March 14, 1895, favoring the Luther League movement—has however a word of caution to give and suggests another "abuse" and danger in this connection. He says: "What the Church needs is to engage all its energies in the work of building up Christ's kingdom on earth, in the salvation of souls. With the increasing wordliness and diversions of all kinds to draw away the young from the Church, it is important that we make use of every proper means, in harmony with the principles of our faith, to interest them in the cause of the Master and strengthen in them loyalty to their spiritual mother." * * * "We believe the League has come to stay, and all loyal Lutherans should do all in their power to help steer it past the breakers any new movement is sure to encounter. That its influence is spreading, there is no doubt, and that the end of this year will find several new State Leagues organized is more than probable. There is, however, danger in this, as in every new movement, that some of its most enthusiastic friends will try and push it too fast and produce rather a hot-house growth than the growth of a solid tree. 'Booms,' we have often seen, are not conducive to healthy development, and a city that once was caught in the snare of a 'boom' does not want another. Cæsar's motto,

Festina lente—make haste slowly—may well be kept in mind, especially as far as the calling of a national convention is concerned.” And as regards local societies, in reply to a criticism, “because the students of our Theological Seminary at Mt. Airy are studying the Luther League topics,” we say: “That the theological student takes up the matter, under the direction of our most excellent faculty, is a most healthy sign as it will aid in properly steering the movement, for when they enter the ministry they will be equipped to give direction to the practical lines of Church and so be able to avoid serious blunders. And it is specially important in order to avoid the abuses existing in the Christian Endeavor and Epworth League movements, where the pastor is often disregarded and the Endeavor Society meeting is made to take the place of the regular Church service. And just here lies a danger which must be guarded against, that the Luther League be not regarded as an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*—a church within a Church. We have heard of loud complaints by pastors, who had a Christian Endeavor Society or an Epworth League, that when the pastor came to hold the regular service, the members of the Society departed for their homes, their meeting being over. This should never occur in a Luther League, even if there is a meeting immediately before the Church service, and it will not occur, if properly organized and directed.”

C. *Recapitulation and Reflections.*

The Luther League movement, at large and local, still appears much in the condition of a ship at sea with divers helmsmen attempting to steer it towards some goal as to each seems best. Its intersynodical character and latitudinarianism as federation at large proscribes discriminating confessional fidelity, exempts from responsible Church government and amenability to it—and in certain quarters affords hopes of its paving the way for a still broader platform even unto universal inter-denominational unionism. It is claimed to be “pre-eminently a young people’s organization”—“and this is (avowedly) one of its most excellent features”—from which in lax direction much is expected. On the other hand it is hailed as the ultima thule of hope for the future of historical Lutheranism. But with Scylla and Charybdis ahead clever heads caution that—“All loyal Lutherans should do all in their power to help steer it past the breakers any new move-

ment is sure to encounter." The question remains: Who is the steering committee? Did the Church launch this excursion? Does not its chief charm lie in the incentive to the junior laity that they in this cruise shall have their turn at the helm? And when they in keeping therewith proceeded to business, a la ecclesiola in ecclesia, as "in the Christian Endeavor and Epworth League movements, where the pastor is often disregarded and the Endeavor Society meeting is made to take the place of the regular Church service"—need any one wonder? "Booms (well said) are not conducive to healthy development." And when the Church has and is responsible for the right of way there should be no arbitrary train-dispatching.

"If the question be raised, what is the special use of these Young People's Societies?" We are informed: "It is primarily a *religious use*"—then quickly follows the frank admission: "I am well aware that this is not always strictly observed. But it dare not be wholly ignored." Who then is responsible for the neglect? Is it the pastor, or is he abroad? If he be not ex-officio director on whom shall devolve the function properly and wisely to train the youth to become more efficient Sunday School teachers, more capable members of Church councils, more intelligent and thoroughly educated Christians by means of such societies? The reverend speaker assumes that, "So far as the pastor is concerned he can put them to a very practical use"—always provided that their inclinations do not run too much another way and that the usual self-assertion of such solidary bodies prove not too strong adversely. So long as the pastor is the center of a nucleus of young people he will find prompt response, but when they move as a self-constituted organization in their own grooves, the spirit of their leader is apt to play an important part in the consideration. And the conception young people ordinarily have of extended federation, as offset to the Y. M. C. A., Epworth League and Christian Endeavor Societies—does not incline them to take kindly to too much "pastoral interference." The real in the matter, under vague conception of the Church and its office, falls far short of the ideal. And the suggestion that the pastor's "aim should be to allot to each member some specific and individual work"—seems under existing conditions utopian, particularly in view of the "constant and morbid desire for some form of entertainment (on the part of) our Young People's Societies (since it is admitted that)

that seems to be the magnetic force which draws and holds them together." Surely under such incentive to coalition young folks' combines are not in serious mood to work and spiritually to improve under pastoral direction. The reverend speaker's account, however, of graded departments in his own fold, suggests the possibility of well organized classification and service in the congregation, among young and old, in keeping with the Church's organism and without independentistic integration of extraneous trammels. Significant as to the graded subdivisions in the speaker's congregation is the point: "As unifying head over all stands the pastor."

Why should the pastor not hold such position in any Church scheme, even of inter-federation? If, as is claimed, "Young people lend themselves easily to organization and organized effort"—why not, discountenancing experiment at the outset, organize them on a sound Church basis, free from compromising alliances, guide and keep them aright?

The question is one of import. Organization and mass-federation lure. There is eclat in numbers, and conspicuous prominence before the public is flattering. Shall this be the goal of the striving, and young folks' societies of whatever name, with but nominal subscription to an historical confession, count chiefly as but stepping stones to its attainment? Or shall feeding the lambs and leading them heavenward in the paths of righteousness, in keeping with divine appointments within the providential environments of the home fold, be the primal object of our Spiritual solicitude? Either course will have an educating influence, and will have a corresponding characteristic impress upon the rising generation and on the Church's future. Which shall it be? The one course ignores place and principle, the fitness and discipline of relation and subordination, the other respects vocation, duty and order. The one is artificial, the other natural. The one exotic, the other promises solid growth. After all we shall find the Lord's way the best way. As the Tabernacle was fashioned after the pattern Moses saw on the Mount, so the Church is planned to answer divine purpose. The Great Shepherd of the sheep places lambs *within* the fold. That is their legitimate position and sphere. "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the

ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. 4, 11, 12.

D. *Luther League of the Joint Synod of Ohio — East.*

As this subject has heretofore been treated in the columns of this Magazine, a brief outline of the principles and policy of the League movement among us will suffice.

Theoretically the local society is a sub-department of the congregation and comprises its confirmed youth. Its voting membership for the transaction of casual business includes all such junior Church members who place their name on the roll and attend its meetings. As the parochial school in its religious features, the Sunday School and cathechetical class, so the local league as subdivision of the congregation, and on the like grade with the "Kinderlehre," is designed to be a post-catechumenal training-school of the junior members of the flock in the hand of the pastor. It is the pastor who conducts the course of instruction, be it in Scripture, Confessions, distinctive doctrines, Church history or on vital religious topics of the day. And the young people are led to engage in the practical lines of Church duty, not in a separate sense as Luther Leaguers, but as integral parts of the Church—as Church members.

Church membership in the order of Christ's appointments is impressed as the paramount relation and the congregation as the paramount body, with its pastor as divinely ordained presiding official and under shepherd of the flock. Leaving Church legislation, the management of congregational affairs where it belongs—to the congregation as such, its Council and committees, the junior membership holds stated assemblies with the pastor, as his parishioners, in the spirit of a Mary as well as that of a Martha, for supplementary instruction and guidance in knowledge and grace and efficiency in the Master's service. In keeping with the congregational principle of Church government, general Church affiliation beyond local bounds is regarded as exclusively a matter of the congregation—its pastor and representative membership. The congregation decides such extraneous relation for itself and its youth—and beyond such limits a junior department of the congregational family, as local league, presumes not to go.

But the junior membership among us will recognize

and meet in Churchly affiliation with the junior membership of such Lutheran congregations with whom the home Church has formed regular synodical affiliation. And this do they with the sanction and under the leadership of their respective pastors. The Central League, accordingly, comprises the pastors and delegates of local leagues, conjoined within Synodical bounds, assembled once a year in joint convention. The presiding officials of such Central League must irrevocably be chosen from among the clergy; secretary and treasurer may be elected from the laity of either sex. And as to language, the German and English tongues—as on the floor of the Synod, are placed on a perfect parity, subject to the choice of the individual. The several conventions thus far held—have grown in interest with each succeeding year, and, as virtually but delightful public pastoral conferences, have approved themselves as popularly instructive theological institutes, with full audiences of representative young people and members of the Church, entertaining the Convention, in attendance. In addition, a divine service with addresses in both languages is regularly held. With Teachers' Institute, Chautauqua and Summer Bible-Schools in vogue elsewhere as the order of the day—why not an annual Lutheran doctrinal training school of a few days' duration for the young people of our Churches? The seed thus sown in local circles and at the Central convention, with God's blessing, why should it not yield increase? And thus even a Luther League will find its proper place and status in the Church.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

THE NATURAL RESULT OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD, OR
JUSTIFICATION, IS A HOLY LIFE: Chapters VI-VIII.

CHAPTER VIII.

A. *Being Justified, we live in the Spirit who has Delivered us from Sin and Death: Vv. I-II.*

Having in the latter part of the preceding chapter depicted the lamentable condition of the Christian in so far as he still has flesh, that is, his old, sinful nature, the Apostle

proceeds to show his blessed state in so far as now, after his conversion, he is in most intimate connection with the divine Savior of mankind as He has appeared in Jesus of Nazareth, who has delivered him from sin and all its consequences. In this connection, as already appears from what was stated before (7, 25), the Christian needs not fear any condemnation or punishment of sin (1). For in this connection and union with Christ Jesus he is under a new law and rule, that of the Holy Spirit who gives life and happiness, and thus has been freed from the law and rule of sin that ends in death and damnation (2). Not even the divine moral Law could bring about this deliverance, weakened and hindered in its efficacy, as it was, by the flesh (comp. 7, 18); God Himself had to do it, in an extraordinary manner, if it was to be done at all. And He did it by sending His own Son in the form of sinful man, though without sin Himself, and for the sake of conquering sin; and thus sin lost its power and dominion in the very flesh or human nature wherein hitherto it had ruled supreme, Christ, as true man, conquering sin and communicating His victory to everyone that in faith accepts Him as his

V. 1. *Ἄρα*: drawing the conclusion from 8, 25a, where it was briefly stated, or rather intimated, what a Christian owes to Jesus Christ. *Νῦν*: after Jesus has become our Savior. *Οὐδέποτε* has the emphasis: none of any kind or degree. *Τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν* scil. *οὖσιν*: for those that have their being in Him, live and move in Him, viz., by justifying faith.

V. 2. *Νόμος* must here have about the same sense as 7, 23, namely, rule or dominion. The "law of the mind" mentioned there is the effect of the "law of the Spirit," as the *subjective* state and condition of regenerate man is the result of the *objective* operation of the Holy Ghost. The "law in the members" and "the law of sin" in 7, 23, are of course identical with the "law of sin and death" in our passage. *Τῆς ζωῆς* is dependent on *τοῦ πνεύματος*: the Spirit of life is the Spirit that gives and works life. *Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν* is best construed with the following verb *ἡλευθέρωσεν*, not with the preceding noun *ζωῆς*, in conformity with the sense of verse 1: in Christ Jesus this deliverance has come to man, and whoever by faith is in Him, receives and enjoys it. *Σε*, being entirely unexpected after all the pronouns of the first person in the preceding chapter, must be regarded as the genuine reading: the Apostle applies the general sense of verses 1 and 2 to everyone of his readers. "The law of sin" is at the same time "the law of death," because death is the wages of sin (6, 23; comp. 5, 12sqq., 7, 18-24).

Representative and Savior (3). For that was the purpose of God in sending Christ that the righteous requirement of the Law should and could now be fulfilled in us, in our hearts and lives, provided we suffer ourselves to be guided and governed by the Spirit of God, and not by our flesh (4; comp.

V. 3. *Tὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον . . . διὰ τῆς σαρκός* is to be considered either as the absolute nominative, placed rhetorically before the main sentence and having the force of an apposition to the latter, or as the accusative of relation. In the former case the free translation would be: God condemned sin, etc., the very thing that was impossible to the Law, etc.; in the latter: as to that which was impossible to the Law, etc., God condemned sin, etc. We prefer the former explanation. *Tὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου* is what the Law could not do, the point, as the following relative clause explains, "wherein it was weak through the flesh," viz., to deliver us from the rule of sin (comp 7, 5-8sqq.). *Οὐ θεοῦ* is emphatic, in opposition to the Law, as *τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου* is in emphatic opposition to *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. *Τὸν ἔαντον νίσιν*: His own Son, manifesting thereby His unspeakable love that was willing to pay such a price for our redemption. *Πέμψας*: either to be translated "having sent," the incarnation of Christ preceding His redemptive work as its basis; or, "by sending," which also is in accordance with good usage and has the advantage of stating in what way the condemning (*κατέχων*) took place. "In likeness of flesh of sin" the Son of God was sent, bearing the consequences of sin, a real man, as He had to be in order to be our Substitute and Representative; but not a sinner Himself, as again was necessary for our Redeemer (Heb. 7, 26sqq.). The "likeness," or resemblance, hence refers not to "flesh," for He became flesh, was not merely like unto it (John 1, 14); but to "flesh of sin," i. e., sinful flesh (compare note on "flesh," 7, 5), to which He merely bore a likeness. *Καὶ περὶ ἀμαρτίας* is to be construed with *πέμψας*: God sent His own Son not only "in likeness of flesh of sin," but also "concerning," on account of, for, "sin," i. e., for the sake of doing away with it and its injurious rule; because the latter was the purpose and end, the former had to be the mode and form of the sending. "Condemned sin," namely, as the ruling principle and power in fallen man (*τὴν ἀμαρτίαν*, the definite article); "in the flesh," where it hitherto had exercised its baneful power: in and through a true man, Christ, over whom it could not rule, but who in every form and respect overcame it, sin lost its power over man in general, Christ being his Substitute and Representative.

V. 4. *Δικαιώμα*: that which has been decided to be right, righteous demand or requirement (comp. 1, 32). *Πληρωθῆ*: may be fulfilled; the passive voice with *ἐν ἡμῖν*, "in us," not by us, because God alone can bring it about by granting us His Spirit,

2). For those whose nature and being is determined and ruled by the flesh, also have in mind and seek what is pleasing to the flesh, and hence transgress the Law; whilst only those that are governed by the Spirit, have in mind and seek what is pleasing to the Spirit, and hence walk in accordance with the Law (5). That there is such a radical difference

and brings it about first of all in our hearts, and then also in our lives. *Tuīς μὴ κτλ.* describes those of whom, and of whom alone, the preceding statement can be made. *Mὴ*, the subjective negation, can be explained by the dependence on *ἴη*; but it may also be used because a wrong notion or idea is to be guarded against—do not suppose that such persons can walk according to the flesh. *Kατά* states the norm or rule, the congruity or accordance: in accordance with the nature and promptings. Concerning “flesh” and “spirit” compare note on 7, 5. The question here and in the following verses is whether “spirit” means the Holy Ghost as the divine author of spiritual life, or the principle of this spiritual life wrought by Him. The presence or the absence of the definite article does not determine this, as *πνεῦμα* without the article can be a proper noun, which does not need the article, and hence denote the Holy Ghost, and also with the article in a definite way can refer to the spirit of man, the principle of spiritual life created within him by regeneration. Hence the context only can determine the sense. The difficulty, however, is that sometimes both significations will fit the context, the possibility of which is a natural result of the relation between the Holy Spirit and the spiritual life of man. Hence the diversity of opinion with regard to passages of this kind even among the best commentators. Our present section is a case in point. Either signification fits here; and why should we not say that, as a rule, both are meant since the one necessarily includes the other and both form an opposition to “flesh,” though sometimes the one or the other may preponderate (comp. 10)? He that walks in conformity with the Spirit of God that dwells and is active in him, necessarily walks also in conformity with the principle of new, spiritual life wrought in him by the Holy Spirit, and reversely. In our present verse the article is omitted both before “flesh” and “spirit,” because the nature and quality is to be emphasized and contrasted: walking according to what is flesh and to what is spirit.

V. 5. *Ὥντες* and *φρονοῦστιν*, which words are to be supplied respectively after *πνεῦμα* and *πνεύματος*, form a contrast within each clause, whilst the two clauses again form a contrast to each other; and the *περιπατεῖν* in verse 4 is the necessary result of the *εἰναι* and the *φρονεῖν* in verse 5. Hence verse 5 shows why in those only that live in accordance with spirit the Law is being fulfilled. *Τὰ τῆς σαρκός (τοῦ πνεύματος)* that which belongs to, serves

between the two classes becomes apparent also from the respective end they attain: what the flesh seeks, contains and brings death, the wages of sin; what the Spirit seeks, is eternal life and happiness (6; comp. 6, 23). And this cannot be otherwise, since what the flesh seeks is hostile to God, as the flesh does not submit to the will of God as revealed in the Law, yea, cannot even do this because of its inborn depravity and sinfulness (7). And hence it is a matter of course that those who remain in the power and under the rule of the flesh cannot please God, and consequently must suffer death (8). True Christians, however, are not ruled by the flesh, but by the Spirit, since the Spirit of God has made His habitation in them and is never inactive; and whoever has not this Spirit of God, or, which is the same, of Christ, has no part in Christ, is not a Christian (9). But if Christ in and by His Spirit dwells in a person, the body, indeed, still is a prey to death and dissolution, because sin still clings to it;

and pleases, the flesh (spirit). *Tῆς σαρκός* and *τοῦ πνεύματος* (the, definite article) because referring to that definite flesh and spirit that rules them.

V. 6. *Φρόνημα* is the result of *φρίνεται*, its object and goal. That of the flesh is death, not consciously and subjectively, but objectively, as the ordinance of a holy and righteous God. "Peace," in accordance with the Hebrew equivalent (**שָׁלוֹם**), denotes also security, prosperity, happiness, well-being of every kind, especially spiritual, as promised in the Old Testament and acquired by Christ (comp. 2, 10; Luke 2, 14).

V. 7. The subject of *ὑποτάσσεται* is *σάρξ*, the logical subject of the whole verse; *φρόνημα* does not fit as such in its proper sense (verse 6). *Οὐδὲ γάρ*: for not even.

V. 8. *Ἐν σαρκὶ* is as to the general sense = *κατὰ σάρκα* in verse 5; but whilst the latter denotes the rule and norm, the former expresses the element, the sphere and dominion, hence is the stronger expression, corresponding to *σάρκινος* 7, 14.

V. 9. *Εἴπερ* if really, if indeed: Christians cannot but be in the sphere and under the rule of the Spirit; if it were otherwise the Spirit of God could not dwell in them: the one includes the other. The second half of our verse emphasizes the *εἴπερ*, the inherent necessity for Christians of being ruled by the Spirit. The way in which here Spirit of Christ and Spirit of God are used as identical, puts Christ and God on a level; for the genitives *Θεοῦ* and *Χριστοῦ* must have the same relation to *πνεῦμα*, viz., be possessive (comp. John 14, 16; 15, 26; Gal. 4, 6). The Apostle changed the expression from "Spirit of God" to "Spirit of Christ" because he wanted to emphasize the possession of the Spirit as an absolute requirement of a *Christian*. *Ἄντοι* of course refers to Christ, being

but the new spirit that dwells in him in its very essence is life because of the righteousness that Christ has acquired for him and by His Spirit wrought in him, the former making and the latter proving him an heir of eternal life (10). And if God who raised Jesus the Christ, our Savior, from the dead and thereby proved that He could and would also raise those that are Christ's, if He already has given His Spirit to dwell in our hearts and work life, we can rest assured that this very God will also do what is still wanting for perfect life, namely on the last day give life to our as yet mortal bodies, just because He as a pledge and earnest has already here deigned us to be dwellings of His Spirit (11).

also the possessive genitive, expressing an internal relation. *Οὗτος* is emphatic: an infallible proof and mark. *Οὐκ ἔχει* (*οὐ* in a conditional sentence) lacks.

V. 10. Where the Spirit is there is Christ, there is the Triune God, as revealed in the New Testament (comp. John 14, 16-18. 23). "The body" is the instrument of sin (7, 23sq.). "Dead" (*νεκρόν*), not simply "mortal" (*μητά*, verse 11), emphasizes the power of death manifesting itself in the body from our very birth. *Τὸ πνεῦμα* here evidently, in opposition to *τὸ σῶμα*, is to be taken subjectively (comp. verse 4), denoting a part or side of regenerate man. "Righteousness," according to the context, which treats of sanctification, not justification, must include personal righteousness, which, however, presupposes the imputed righteousness of Christ as its absolutely necessary basis and its sole source. "Sin" and "righteousness" both are without an article, denoting every kind and class. The *διά* does not make impossible the understanding of *δικαιοσύνην* as including personal righteousness, since it does not necessarily express merit, as is shown by the use of it in the next verse. The Apostle simply wants to emphasize the necessary connection between sin and death on the one hand and righteousness and life on the other.

V. 11. *Εἰ* c. indic. in itself simply expresses a condition from which the consequence necessarily follows, but frequently, as here in the context, implies the fulfilment of the condition. That God raised the man Jesus from the dead proves that He *can* raise also us, the fellow-men of Jesus; that He raised Christ, the promised Messiah and Redeemer, who had come in this man Jesus, assures us that He *will* raise also us, the disciples and members of this Christ Jesus. "Mortal" (*μητά*), not "dead" (*νεκρά*), our bodies are called here because the resurrection will be the deliverance not simply from a temporary state and condition (death), but also from an ever impending fate (mortality). *Διά τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα* is the reading that because of the context is to be preferred over against *διά* with the genitive, which has at least an equal external

B. *The Spirit Assures us of our Adoption and Eternal Salvation, notwithstanding our Sufferings here whose Final Transition into Unspeakable Glory is insured to us by the Groaning of Creation, of ourselves, and of the Spirit, as also by the Eternal Counsel of God:* Vv. 12-39.

Since we owe our happy condition as Christians solely to the Spirit, and not to the flesh, it stands to reason that we are not under any obligation to the latter to live in accordance with its lusts (12). For if we did this we should only deprive ourselves of the very blessing bestowed by the Spirit, life eternal. This blessing can be enjoyed only when by the grace and power of the Spirit we put to death, stifle in the very beginning, the practices and evil doings of the body wherein the flesh still manifests itself and tries to gain control over us. For the death of the flesh is the life of the spirit; and reversely (13). For only those that are led and governed by the Spirit of God are the children of God and

testimony in the manuscripts; moreover, the New Testament nowhere else teaches that God will raise the dead through the Holy Ghost, this being rather the office of the Son (comp. John 5, 21sqq.; 6, 33sqq.). Mark the emphatic position of *ἐνοικεῖντας* and *αδτιῶν*: that God's Spirit *dwells in us*, thereby making our bodies His temples (1 Cor. 6, 19), is the (not meritorious, but natural, matter-of-course) cause of the glorious resurrection of our bodies, these essential parts of our humanity.

V. 12. *Ἄρα οὖν, so then*, a conclusion drawn from verses 10sq., especially verse 11. *Οφειλέται ἐσμέν: debtors we are*, bound to serve somebody (comp. 6, 19); but "not to the flesh, in order to live in accordance with the flesh" (*τοῦ . . . ζῆν*, the genitive of the infinitive expressing the purpose of such an obligation). The opposite (but we are rather debtors to the Spirit in order to live in accordance with the Spirit) is not expressed because the Apostle wants to emphasize the negative side, viz., that our former service of sin must cease if we want to enjoy the blessings of justified persons.

V. 13. *Μέλλετε*: you are about, you must, you will—denoting a certain, inevitable result of the condition mentioned, viz., a life according to the flesh (*ζῆτε*, present tense, lasting state and condition). *Ἀποθνήσκετε* in this connection means a death from which there will be no deliverance (comp. verse 11), eternal death. *Πνεύματι* dat. instrum.: by the Spirit. The "body" (comp. verse 10) is in a manner personified, as practising trickery. *Ζήσεσθε* the opposite of *μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκετε*: eternal life.

can have eternal life and happiness (14). And they are children of God indeed; for the Spirit that they have received to lead and govern them is not a spirit characteristic of bondage and slavery, so that again they would be in a state of fear as formerly, before being Christians; but He is a spirit proper to adoption and sonship, a spirit that imparts the right and courage confidently to address God as our dear Father (15). This very Spirit by His testimony in

V. 14. To live in the sense of verse 13 and to be a *son* of God (*vioi* emphatic) is identical; the one is the necessary concomitant of the other. *"Ἄγονται: are being led*—habitual state and condition. *"Οἳστι . . . ὑπτοι:* all those, and only those.

V. 15. The Apostle proves his assertion in verse 14 by the experience of his readers: they are being led by the Spirit of God and from this they know that they are children of God, and they act as such children. *Διανοίας* and *υἱωθεσίας* are genitives denoting intimate connection and communion. "You received" (the repetition is emphatic), when you became Christians. "Again unto fear": every natural man, because of his consciousness of being a transgressor of the laws of a holy and righteous God, is leading a life of fear, like a slave who has to dread the anger and punishment of his master, and hence every gentile religion is a religion of (servile) fear and bondage; but also the Old Testament religion, being intended to prepare especially the people of Israel for the reception of the Redeemer by a multitude of commandments whose transgressions were to convince them of being damnable sinners and sorely standing in need of a Savior partook to a great extent of this character of fear, though not necessarily abject servile fear. The Christian religion, as fully revealed in the New Testament, certainly is *the* religion of (filial) love. *Ὑιωθεσία—vὶὸν τοῦτον* is the divine act of adoption whereby God graciously, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ whose merits have been appropriated by faith, makes a sinner His son, adopts him (comp. Gal. 4, 5; Eph. 1, 5; also Rom. 9, 4, speaking of the adoption of Israel as the theocratic son of God). See, however, verse 23, where this usual signification is somewhat modified. 'Ἐν φ̄ the element wherein a Christian lives, the rule that is supreme with him. *'Ἄββᾶ δ πατήρ*—the former the Aramaic original—the Hebrew **אבא**, the latter the Greek translation (*δ πατήρ*, the nominative with the article as an apposition to a noun in the vocative, according to classical usage). Christ always called God His Father and taught His disciples to call and address Him in the same loving and confident way (e. g. in the so-called Lord's Prayer); and He no doubt as a rule used the Aramaic language, then the vernacular of the Holy Land, and thus *Abba* came to be a favorite appellation of God in prayer, to which expression later on Christians using the Greek language,

our hearts assures us that it is not a vain imagination of our mind when we rejoice in being beloved children of God (16). But if in truth we are such beloved children, we shall certainly also eventually possess and enjoy all that is our Heavenly Father's, together with Christ who is Son and Heir in the first place and by His atonement has made us His brethren and co-heirs. We shall be His partners in heaven if we prove ourselves His partners here on earth by suffering as He suffered, for the sake of His name; for this is the divinely-appointed way to heaven and its glory (17).

That Christians here on earth have to suffer does not show in the least that they are not the beloved children of God; for whatever they may have to suffer in the present short time is not at all worthy of being compared with the glory that is in store for them, invisible as yet but sure to be revealed in the life to come (18). That such a glory

regarding *Abba* as a kind of proper noun, added the Greek translation. Compare Mark 14, 36, where the Evangelist translates for his (Roman) readers the word "Abba" by adding "father," just as it is in our verse, and Gal. 4, 6.

V. 16. *Ἄντο τὸ πνεῦμα*: the *Spirit Himself*; His testimony is added to that of our own (regenerated) spirit, is the source and basis of it, ever accompanying it. This testimony of the Holy Spirit is borne through the Word of God which He applies and seals to our hearts, rendering us immovably sure of its divine truth and authority. *Ἐσπέρι* emphatic: we are in truth and reality. *Τέξια*: a more tender and endearing term than the more dignified *οἰνοί* (verse 14); the former emphasizes the internal, cordial relation, the latter the external, legal (compare *child* and *son*).

V. 17. *Μέν . . . δέ*: on the one hand . . . on the other, emphasizing *Θεοῦ* and *Χριστοῦ*; that is our glorious hope that we are to partake in what God and Christ possess, in divine glory and happiness. *Ἐπερ* (comp. verse 9): that is the inevitable condition for a sinner who is to be led from his fallen state to eternal bliss (comp. Matt. 10, 38; 16, 24; 20, 22sq.). *Ίνα*: the object and end of suffering with Christ, both in the mind of God and in the consciousness of the child of God.

V. 18. *Λογίζομαι*: I reckon, consider—a well-considered judgment, no hasty, baseless opinion (comp. 3, 28). *Γάρ*: justifies the condition of our glorification mentioned by the Apostle in the preceding verse, and proves that our sufferings do not, as men are apt to judge, destroy the certainty of it. "Not worthy" has the emphatical position. *Καιροῦ*: a definitely-limited portion of time, having also reference to its quality; the period of our sufferings is limited, not endless, and it is just the proper time for these sufferings that are to prepare us for everlasting bliss. *Ἄξια πρός*:

awaits them is proven by the fact that the whole irrational creation surrounding man anxiously longs for the time when the sons of God will be revealed and manifestly treated as such, enjoying all the privileges of their exalted position (19). For not only man, but also the whole creation round about him, has, in consequence of man's fall, become subject to vanity, that is, to a condition and existence that is not in accordance with the end and purpose for which they were created. Man came into this state willingly, sinning and falling forewarned, by his own free will; but the creation surrounding him was, without any fault of its own, simply drawn into the condition and fate of its human lord and master, because the Creator had decreed that it should share his lot, augmenting his self-inflicted misery as it had increased his original bliss. And in accordance with this divine arrangement the hope was left to creation that when the beloved children of God, those men that suffer themselves by divine grace to be restored to their original blessed condition, at the time of the manifestation of their glory are made perfectly free from sin and all its consequences, then it also shall share the lot of these men, being delivered from corruption and decay and the consequent service of the vain purposes of sinful man — a blessed and happy creation surrounding a blessed and happy humanity (20 sq.). A Chris-

worth with regard to, in comparison with=worthy to be compared with. *Μέλλουσαν*, in emphatical position, opposed to "the *present* time" (*νῦν*), has also here the sense of certainty (comp. verse 13). *Εἰς ἡμᾶς*: unto us, towards us, coming from heaven with Christ and becoming our possession.

V. 19. *Αποζαραδοτία*: lit., watching with outstretched head=eager, anxious longing; *ἀπεκδέχεται*: awaits patiently and longingly. *Κτίσεως*: can neither mean the act of creation, nor include the angels, good or bad, nor men, pious or impious, but merely the irrational creatures surrounding fallen man; for of them only can be said what the following verses state. "The revelation of the sons of God" (gen. obj.) is the time when the longing of the creation will be fulfilled, its lot and condition being bound to that of man. This creation is here personified, as also verse 22.

V. 20. *Ματαιότητι*: vanity, a state and condition that is in vain, unprofitable, useless, does not lead to the end desired or designated, which is here the glory and honor of God and the real welfare of man. *Διὸ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα*: "because of Him who subjected (it)," merely because He in His wisdom and power willed it. *Ἐπι-ελπίδι* is to be construed with *ὑπεράγη*, co-ordinate with the two preceding phrases modifying this verb.

tian knows from the Word of God and his own experience that there is a sad contradiction between the divine purpose and original state of creation, and the present actual condition of the world surrounding him, the latter continually suffering from the sin of man and hence, so to speak, in all its parts groaning and anxiously awaiting the longed-for change. And this universal and continuous suffering of creation, this perversion of His good and gracious will with regard to His irrational creatures, God can and will not let go on forever; it must come to an end, but it can have an end only when a perfect humanity again has come into existence, when the glory of the children of God is revealed; and hence it is a prophecy and proof of this revelation (22).

But it is not only the creation surrounding man that is groaning in its present unhappy condition and longing for a change and deliverance. The Christians themselves, since they have received the Holy Spirit as the first fruits, as the earnest and pledge of the perfect happiness and glory promised them, accordingly in the deep recesses of their hearts always long for the fulfilment of these promises, i. e., for the full realization and enjoyment of their adoption as children of God, for the final deliverance from the last vestiges of sin and its consequences, which during this whole life manifest

V. 21. "Also the creation itself," not only man. "The servitude of corruption"=the servitude connected with corruption, resulting from it; just as "the liberty of the glory of the children of God" is the liberty that is connected with, and a result of, that glory. That which is served is the vanity to which the creation is subjected (verse 20); and this servitude is the result of the corruption that in consequence, and as a punishment, of man's fall has also befallen the creation about him. *Ἐις τὴν ἐλεύθερίαν* is a pregnant construction in accordance with classical usage, the verb *ἐλευθερώθησεται* including the idea of bringing. "The liberty" is the freedom from sin and its consequences, vanity and corruption. With regard to the change between *ὑπόν* and *τέλεων* in this and the preceding verse compare note on verse 16; the different shade of meaning can be traced also here.

V. 22. *Γάρ*: a proof of the certain final deliverance of the creation, viz., the groaning and travailing of the whole creation in all its parts up to the present time. The prefix *συν* in the two verbs refers to "all the creation," all its parts acting together; *ῳδίω* means to travail, to feel the pains of childbirth, and here refers to the new state and condition that the personified creation (comp. verse 19) painfully longs to see come forth out of the old corruption, as a woman painfully longs for the birth of her child.

themselves especially in their frail and mortal bodies (23). For their salvation in its full realization and fruition is still a thing of the future, not visible to human eyes, and therefore an object of patient hope and earnest longing (24 sq.). And this state of imperfection and consequent longing for perfection is again a prophecy and proof of the latter, as surely as God does not leave His work imperfect forever.

V. 23. "But not only" does the whole creation groan and long for deliverance, "but also ourselves," etc. *Tὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες*: the question is, in the first place, whether the genitive is partitive, or appositional; in the second place, whether the participle expresses a cause or reason ("because we have"), or a concession ("although we have"). The usual construction of *ἀπαρχὴ* is in favor of regarding *τοῦ πνεύματος* as the partitive genitive (comp. 16, 5; 1 Cor. 15, 20; 16, 15; James 1, 18); but the manner in which the Scriptures speak of the Holy Ghost as a gift bestowed not only in part upon Christians here on earth (comp. e. g. 2 Cor. 1, 22; 5, 5; Eph. 1, 14), is against it, as is also the context which requires that the final and perfect gift be not a greater portion of the Holy Ghost, but perfect deliverance from sin and its consequences or perfect glorification (comp. also verse 11). If this interpretation of the genitive is correct the participle must stand for a *causal* sentence. *Ἡμεῖς καὶ ἀντοῖ:* an emphatic repetition. *Ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* (*ἑαυτοῖς* = *ἡμῖν ἀντοῖς*, as already in classical authors): though we may not always talk about it complainingly or sentimentally. *Γνωθεσία* is here not the divine act itself of bestowing sonship and the right involved, but the full fruition and enjoyment of the bestowal of this dignity and right. This is evident from a comparison of verse 15, where it is stated that we have this adoption already here on earth, as also from the immediate context, the words following, "the redemption of our body," viz., its deliverance from the consequences of sin (gen. obj.), being an explanatory apposition to "adoption."

V. 24. *Tῇ ἐλπίδι*, placed emphatically, cannot be the dat. instrum., since faith, not hope, is everywhere in the New Testament represented as the means of appropriating salvation, and hope is always distinguished from this saving faith (comp. 1 Cor. 13, 13). It can be the dat. modi so that the sense would be "in hope," though in our opinion that would be *ἐλπίδι* without the definite article which would be entirely out of place in this signification. And as in the next clause *ἐλπίς* must have the signification found in classical writers as well as in the New Testament (Col. 1, 5; Heb. 6, 18; comp. also 1 Tim. 1, 1), viz., the object of hope, we think that those are right that most naturally take it here in the same sense and translate: "for the object of hope," i. e., the full enjoyment of our adoption, the perfect deliverance from sin and its con-

But there is still another groaning as proof and prophecy of the final deliverance of the Christians: in their weakness, when they do not know how to pray in accordance with the requirements of their needs and troubles, the Holy Spirit comes to their assistance by interceding for them with God in groanings for which they cannot find words (26), but which are heard by God who, as the Omniscient One, knows that the object of the intercession of the Spirit is in accordance with His good and gracious will, and that He intercedes for men that belong to God as His justified and sanctified children. And this intercession of the Spirit again finds its final and perfect hearing in the full revelation of the glory of those for whom He intercedes, hence is a prophecy and proof of it (27).

sequences, "we have been saved"; the ultimate object, the final goal of the salvation brought about by Christ, is still a matter of the future and therefore of hope. The article before $\varepsilon\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma$ then points back to the preceding verse which states what the object of our hope is, and the sense is: the object of hope just mentioned, the idea of hope naturally having the emphasis. The next clause accordingly must be translated: "but an object of hope that is (already) seen is (no more) an object of hope"; and the truth of this assertion is proved by the rhetorical question: "for what a person sees, why does he also" (in addition to seeing it=still) "hope for it?" (or, according to the reading that omits $\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\chi\alpha\iota$ before $\varepsilon\lambda\pi\iota\varsigma\epsilon\iota$: "who hopes for what he sees?").

V. 25. *El . . . ελπίζομεν*, which, as has been shown, is the case; then the natural consequence is (comp. verse 11): "through," with, in, "patience," steadfastness, endurance, "we longingly wait for it." All which shows the cause and object, and also the firm basis of hope, for our groaning.

V. 26. "In the same way," viz., as the creation and Christians groan, "also the Spirit" groans, which groaning is immediately described as assisting our own imperfect groaning. "Our weakness" is to be understood in general, but as it manifests itself also in our groaning, which with a child of God naturally takes the form of prayer. *Tó* makes the sentence $\tau\acute{\iota} . . . \delta\acute{e}i$ a noun dependent on $\nu\ddot{\o}z\ o\ddot{\iota}\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ as its object, a mode of expression peculiar to the Greek, which can hardly be imitated in English; leaving out the *τό* we translate: "for what we should pray" (*προσευξάμενα* conj. delib. or dubit.) "in accordance with what is necessary" (*χαθό=χατδ τοῦτο δ*). This shows our weakness and the necessity of the Spirit's assistance. *Αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα*: comp. verse 16. *Ὑπερεντυγχάνει=ἐντυγχάνει δηὲρ ήμῶν*: intercedes, addresses God in prayer, in our behalf, for our benefit, in our stead.

The last and deepest foundation for the certainty of the Christian's salvation and glorification, notwithstanding all his afflictions and tribulations, is his knowledge from divine revelation and his own experience that to those that love God as His redeemed and justified children everything that may betide them, evil as well as good, must be helpful to attain the desired end, the salvation of their souls, by drawing them nearer to God and His grace. And this, because the call extended to them through the means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, which made them loving children of God by kindling faith in their hearts, was not something accidental and fortuitous, but the result and execution of a divine purpose and decree (28). For those whom God by

V. 27. "He that searcheth the hearts," is a frequent designation of God as the Omniscient One (comp. 1 Sam. 16, 7; 1 Kings 8, 39; Ps. 7, 9; Prov. 15, 11; Jer. 17, 9sq.; Acts 1, 24; Rev. 2, 23), especially fitting here where what the Spirit does in the heart of man is spoken of as known by God. *Φρόνησις* (comp. verse 6): what the Spirit has in mind in His groanings whose sense cannot be expressed in human words. How is *ὅτι* to be taken? Causal: "because He intercedes according to (the will of) God, etc.," or declarative: "that, etc."? As the former explanation would seem to imply that otherwise God would not know it, hence would not be omniscient, we prefer the latter. *Ὑπέρ ἀγίων* has an emphatical position; the article is missing because the quality is to be accentuated.

V. 28. *Δέ*: adding a new point: *moreover*. The subject of *συνεργεῖ* is most naturally, and also generally, taken to be *πάντα*. It must, however, be conceded that the subject could be taken out of *τὸν θεόν*, viz., He; some manuscripts even insert *οὐ θεός* after *συνεργεῖ*. Then *πάντα* would have to be translated "with regard to all (things)," or, "in all (things)," being the accusative of relation. The usual reading and interpretation is, however, to be preferred, and the *συν-* is to be understood as in verse 22, i. e., that all the different parts of *πάντα* work together. If the subject of *συνεργεῖ* is taken to be God the *συν-* would most naturally be construed with *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν*: He works together with them, whilst in our explanation the latter expression is the dat. commodi: "for them," unto them. "For," or, to, "those that are called in accordance with a purpose": this evidently is added as the reason for the preceding statement. Because those that love God are called in accordance with a purpose everything, also suffering and affliction, must work together for them unto that which is good and salutary (*ἀγαθόν*). Note that *πρόκεισται* is without the article, hence indefinite. *Κλητοί* does not in itself denote those that have accepted the call (Matt. 22, 14); in this connection, however, where it is predi-

His omniscience already in eternity knew as His own in persevering faith and consequent love, those He also already then ordained to become like unto Christ, the author of their adoption and salvation, in heavenly glory (29); and those

cated of those that love God, it naturally does. The question arises, whether all that are called, also those that do not accept the call, are called according to a purpose. The answer to this question depends upon what is understood by this "purpose." According to the context it certainly must be a purpose that assures those that love God, as such and as long as they are such (*τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν*, partic. pres. denoting duration, lasting state and condition), of their final perfect deliverance and glorification, notwithstanding all the sufferings of the present life. The whole chapter, especially from verse 12 on, speaks only of true, genuine Christians, who by the grace of God steadfastly cling to Christ as their Savior, and of the certainty of their eternal salvation. What this purpose contains in detail we see from the next verse (comp. 9, 11; Eph. 1, 11; 3, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9).

V. 29. "*Οτι*: causal, giving the reason for the statement of the preceding verse, especially the last clause, explaining the purpose according to which those that love God have been called and which assures them that everything is working together for their salvation. *Προέγνω*: the verb *προγνωσκω* in classical Greek means exactly what would be expected from a verb compounded of *πρό* and *γνωσκω*, according to the usual signification of these words, viz., to know, perceive, learn, understand beforehand; in a few passages it seems to signify to judge or provide beforehand, an action of the will based, as a matter of course, on a preceding action of the intellect as to the future. In fact, it is a logical and philological impossibility that *γνωσκω*, or any verb having for its fundamental and distinctive notion that of an act of the intellect, should ever, either as a simple verb or in composition, have a signification not based on, and ultimately proceeding from, the fundamental one expressing an activity of the intellect. In the New Testament we find *προγνωσκω* having the same signification of knowing beforehand. That this, and nothing else, is the sense of the verb, Acts 26, 5, and 2 Pet. 3, 17, needs no proof. Also 1 Pet. 1, 20, this signification is sufficient, *προεγνωσμένον* stating that whilst Christ was manifested to men as our Savior at the end of the times, He was foreknown as such by God already before the foundation of the world. As to our present passage, Rom. 8, 29, and also 11, 2, a slight modification of the sense, which, however, cannot be at variance or out of all connection with the fundamental idea of the verb, is demanded by the context. This modified signification is based on the modified sense of the simple verb *γνωσκω* as used in the Septuagint translation for the

He then in time also called and through this call made His own. And this call, effectual in their case because not rendered void by a wilful and pertinacious resistance, was followed by justification; and the decree of justification includes that of glorification as its natural and normal conse-

Hebrew equivalent יָתָר (comp. Hos. 13, 5; Amos 3, 2), and then also found in the New Testament, namely, Matt. 7, 23; John 10, 14sq.; 1 Cor. 8, 3; Gal. 4, 9; 2 Tim. 2, 19. Some, especially Calvinists of every stripe, maintain that these passages form the valid basis for taking *προγνώσκω* in the passages mentioned in the sense of "predestinate, elect," or a kindred sense. Let us briefly look at those passages. Does Matt. 7, 23, really mean that Christ on the day of judgment will command the hypocrites to depart from Him because He never chose them or made them His own? Would that be a satisfactory reason for condemning them? Evidently this supposed, but unproved, signification of *γνωσκω* will not do here. Just as little, however, the simple usual sense "to know" will do, since in that sense it would not be true that Christ did not know the hypocrites. But how is it when we take *γνωσκω*, as modified by the context, to mean "to know as one's own, as intimately united with one"? Then the, manifestly entirely fitting, sense is: "I never knew you as my own, as belonging to me"; and this, of course, because they were not His own, did not permit themselves to be made His own by having true faith wrought and preserved in their hearts. The same holds good with regard to John 10, 14sq.: Christ knows His own as His sheep, and they know Him as their good Shepherd, just as the Father knows Him as His beloved Son, and He knows the loving Father's such. Evidently the idea of choosing or making ones own fits here just as little as that of simply knowing. *Γνωσκω* in these passages has the signification that our older theologians expressed by *cognoscere* (or, *nosse*) *cum affectu et effectu*, i. e., to have a knowledge coupled with an affect (love) and effect, in other words, with efficacious love. In 1 Cor. 8, 3, this signification is entirely satisfactory; in Gal. 4, 9, it is the only one applicable; in 2 Tim. 2, 19, it exactly fits the context. And in the Old Testament passages, Hos. 13, 5, and Amos 3, 2 (compare also the peculiar use of *γνώσκω* for the Hebrew in passages like Gen. 4, 1; Matt. 1, 25, Luke 1, 34), the idea of knowing and hence treating as one's own, or of a knowledge coupled with efficient love, entirely meets the requirements of the context. The same holds good with regard to *πρόγνωστις*, the noun formed of *προγνώσκω*, which in later classical writers means in general "a perceiving beforehand" and in special a forejudgment of diseases, based of course on an act of the intellect, and in Judith 9, 6; 11, 19 (the Septuagint does not have it), as well as in Acts 2, 23, and 1 Pet. 1, 2, needs no other

quence (30). Thus, then, the divine call is in accordance with a divine purpose, a purpose that even in its widest sense, determining and preparing the way of salvation for all men, cannot be thwarted by anything except the obstinate resistance of the person called; and everyone that has been

signification than that of foreknowledge, coupled in the second New Testament passage with effective love. And it certainly is in opposition to sound exegetical principles to depart from a signification that is in conformity with the fundamental notion of a word, is the only one suitable in some passages and makes good sense in all others, and, instead of applying this, to invent a signification foreign to the fundamental notion and the universally recognized usage of the word because, perhaps, in some passages such signification or idea would not be repugnant to the train of thought. Not every idea that would fit the context need be expressed in a sentence, the writer or speaker preferring to express another one that is just as suitable, or even more so. Hence, if in any one of the above-cited passages the notion of choosing or making one's own should be found to be fitting, that does not prove that the Holy Spirit meant to express there just that idea and did this by using the verb *γιγνώσκω* (γνω) in a sense contradictory to its fundamental idea and general usage.—Now this modified sense of *γιγνώσκω*, demanded by the context in the passages mentioned, is the basis of the modified sense of *προγιγνώσκω* in Rom. 8, 29, and 11, 2. This sense is, namely, no other than to know beforehand as one's own; and, as the context shows, the meaning is that of the eternal foreknowledge of God coupled with effective love. That this sense fits in Rom. 11, 2, we shall see later on. What it means here we will consider now. To "know" and to "love" are here in a manner synonymous, the one including the other: he that knows another one as his own, consequently recognizes and loves him as such; and he that loves the other, does so because he knows and recognizes him as his own. And again the knowledge and love of the one presupposes and includes that of the other. Thus there is a necessary connection between loving God (verse 28) and being known or foreknown by Him (verse 29): the one cannot be without the other (comp. John 10, 14sq.; Gal. 4, 9). Those, then, whom God "foreknew" are those of whom He in His prescience knew in eternity, before they had come into existence, that they would be His own in time by means of divinely-wrought faith in Christ and therefore also recognize and love Him as their heavenly Father, and in this faith and love cling to Him until He would call them to eternal glory. These in His love He then also "foreordained" (*προώρισεν*): concerning them He already in eternity determined and decreed, that they should be "conformed to the image of His Son" with regard to heavenly

called and by the grace and power of God contained and operating in that call has obeyed and followed it may rest assured that if he does not wilfully relinquish it he will surely attain the eternal glory of the children of God, notwithstanding all the afflictions and sufferings of the present times (30).

inheritance and glory (comp. verses 17sq.). This eternal foreordination and decree is then in substance identical with the "purpose" according to which those that love God have been called: it is the purpose, embodied in a decree (Eph. 1, 11), to govern all things so that those that are and remain God's own by faith in Christ and in consequence love God will infallibly, though not irresistibly, attain eternal salvation and glory with Christ, their divine Brother. This antecedently and originally is a universal purpose, embracing all men (*voluntas antecedens*); but in its application to individual men by means of the prescience of God it necessarily, as far as infallible adjudication of eternal salvation is included in it, is limited to those whom God in eternity foreknew as His own (*voluntas consequens*); and in so far of course only these are called according to a purpose. But this secondary limited, or particular, purpose is merely the natural result and outflow of the primary universal, but conditioned purpose, conditioned, namely, on the reception of Christ by faith. And thus this universal purpose of salvation, embracing all men under the same condition, viz., that they receive and retain Christ by faith, is the primary and final source of salvation and all that pertains to it, including the call; and whoever is called, whether he accepts the call and is saved or not, is called in accordance with it. That special purpose, however, that is based upon the prescience of God and hence embraces those only that God foreknew as His own by true and persevering faith, and that insures their final salvation and glorification, notwithstanding all temporal troubles and afflictions, can justly also be called a cause of their calling, namely, a secondary one, naturally, as the personal application, growing out of the primary universal purpose. And thus, as the connection of verses 28 and 29 clearly shows, the Apostle views and presents the matter, speaking, as he does, merely of the elect or the true and constant believers. *Ἐτι τὸ εἰλατ τῷ.* : that is the divine object of the foreordination mentioned. Also this shows that "the image of his Son" refers, not to His sufferings, but to His heavenly glory in which all those that are and remain God's will share with Christ.

V. 30. As already mentioned, the Apostle, in accordance with the tenor of this whole section, speaks of Christians only, of men whom God in eternity foreknew as His own, and whom He therefore foreordained to eternal glory. Hence when it is stated here that in conformity with this foreknowledge and foreordination He also called and justified and even glorified them;

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that nobody and nothing can hinder God from leading us Christians to salvation and glorification, if we simply permit Him to do so (31). How can He who even has given us all the greatest gift in His power, His own dear Son for our suffering and dying Redeemer, refuse graciously to give us in addition anything that is necessary to our full enjoyment of this redemption (32)? Who, to hinder their salvation, can bring any charges against men whom God has chosen as His own when God is the one that justifies them for the sake of His Son whose perfect righteousness they have appropriated by faith (33)? Who, again, can condemn them notwithstanding the weaknesses and sins that still cling to them when Christ who is with them not only has died for them but also

it does not follow that no others are called and, as is the case with those that believe for some time only, justified; these are simply not spoken of here where the Apostle merely is intent upon comforting true and persevering Christians in their manifold troubles and afflictions. *Ἐχάλεσεν, ἐδικαιώσεν*: the aorist, or past tense, because the Apostle here speaks of and to those that already were Christians, had been called, etc.; it applies, however, as a matter of course, to all Christians, of all times.

V. 31. *Εἰ* scil. *ἐστιν*: if God is for us, as He in reality is; and this is the only thing we need in order to be protected against all that may be against us (comp. verse 11). "Who is against us?"= who can prove himself our victorious enemy? *Ημῶν*: the "we" of whom the Apostle here speaks are the same persons of whom he spoke in the preceding verses, viz., true, persevering Christians, no others. The *τις* here includes the *τι*: nobody and nothing can prevent our salvation.

V. 32. "*Οὐς γέ*: "he that is at least the one who"=who even. *Ηῶς*: how is it possible that. *Χαρίσεται*: nothing but grace is the motive; so much the surer we can be of the gift.

V. 33. *Ἐχλεξτῶν* without the article, to emphasize the quality. The "elect of God" are those that God foreknew and consequently foreordained as His own. Since this foreknowlege and foreordination do not extend over all men, because not all accept Christ in true and persevering faith, those over whom they do extend are His *ἐχλεξτοί*, i. e., picked out, chosen, as His own, in accordance with the divine rule and norm laid down in the universal order of salvation referred to in verses 28-29 (comp. Matt. 22, 1-14; John 3, 16; Mark 16, 16; Acts 16, 30sq.). *Θεὸς δὲ δικαιῶν* is best regarded as the affirmative answer to the preceding question, *ἐστιν* being supplied, and not as another question in the sense: Will God who justifies them bring charges against them? The same holds good with regard to *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς κτλ.* in the next verse.

has arisen from the dead as an incontrovertible proof of the sufficiency of His death as the atonement for all their sins, and now, as their exalted Redeemer, at the right hand of God also urges His vicarious merits in their behalf (34)? And who can take away and alienate from them that love of Christ that made Him their self-sacrificing Savior and still prompts Him to do all that is necessary to make them enjoy His salvation? No suffering of any nature, not even violent death itself, frequent as it was in the times of persecution for Christ's sake, can do it (35 sq.). On the contrary, in all these tribulations, through the power and assistance of Him who has proved His love for them by His death, they are more than victorious, not simply overcoming all dangers and temptations, but even deriving benefit from them (37; comp. 28; 5, 3 sqq.). For a Christian is fully assured that on condition of his existence, no power among angels or men, nothing in time, no forces whatsoever, nothing in space, and, in short, no creature of any sort or description, nothing in fact but his own wilful resistance to saving grace will be able to place a barrier between him and the love of God that has been manifested towards him in Christ Jesus, his Savior, and that cannot rest till it has accomplished its work in his glorification (38 sq.).

V. 34. *Μᾶλλον δέ*: more can and must be said. "*Οὐ* . . . *δει* *χαι*: an emphatic and solemn repetition and gradation. *Ἐντυγχάνει*: comp. verse 27. The intercession of Christ takes place in heaven, that of the Spirit within our hearts; the former is meritorious, the latter auxiliary.

V. 35. *Χριστοῦ*: gen. subj., as is clear from verse 34, where His love for us is depicted, and verses 37 and 39. *Θλίψις*, *στεναχωρία*: comp. 2, 9.

V. 36. Explanation and prophecy of *μάχαιρα* (Ps. 44, 23). "The whole day": the killing takes place at every time of the day, now of some, then of others. The history and lot of the Old Testament people of God is typical of that of the New Testament. "We were accounted, etc.": therefore we are being treated thus.

V. 38. *Γάρ*: confirmation of the certainty expressed by *διπερνιζώμεν*. "Neither death" (mentioned first because of the preceding verse) "nor life": the two greatest extremes and forces of human existence. As "angels" is entirely general, including all (comp. Matt. 25, 41), "principalities" is best understood of human rulers and powers.

V. 39. *Ἐτέρα*: of any other kind and nature (comp. 7, 23).

NOTES.

GALILEE DISCUSSION. — A new and profitable discussion of an old problem is found in a brochure published by a veteran member of the Leipzig theological faculty, Prof. R. Hofmann. It is entitled "Gililäa auf dem Ölberg", and claims to be a "contribution to the solution of the seeming contradictions in the gospel accounts of the appearances of Christ after the Resurrection." The difficulties are well known, as they have vexed and perplexed the Church for fifteen hundred years. The famous solution of the Gililee question is substantially the same as that proposed as early as the sixteenth century by the Archbishop of Cointra and adopted by others, namely that the Galilee mentioned in the closing chapters of the Gospels as the place where the risen Lord was to meet the disciples was not the province known by that name, but was the northern of three peaks that composed the Mount of Olives, across which the way from Gililee to Jerusalem led which the pilgrims from that province were accustomed to travel and where there was an inn frequented by Galilean pilgrims and commonly called Galilee. Absolutely positive arguments to the effect that there was a place called Galilee on Mt. Olivet Hofmann does not claim to have produced; but a strong case of probability is made out on the basis of the early fathers and early Palestine travelers, some forty in number. If the conclusion is accepted new light is thrown upon a number of passages, such as Luke 21, 37; John 8, 1; Luke 22, 39, Matt. 21, 1; Mark 11, 1. The merit of Hofmann's work consists in its careful scholarship and its abundance of citations. The author states that he has been a student of this interesting topographical problem for forty years.

BERLIN PROFESSOR. — The University of Berlin, in response to popular demand by the churches, after several unsuccessful attempts to secure a conservative man for the theological faculty, has finally called the gifted young Erlangen professor, Dr. Seeberg. He has accepted, but under condition that he can retain his membership in the Lutheran Church and will not be compelled to ally himself

with the official United Church of Prussia. This concession on the part of the authorities is rather surprising, especially as they refused this permission to Dr. Frank when years ago he was called to Göttingen, also a Prussian University. Seeberg will continue to be in Berlin what he was in Erlangen, a representative of confessional Lutheranism. This is a significant sign of the growth of positive principles in the Protestant Church of Germany.

WORLD'S CONGRESS. — The World's Catholic Congress is being planned for the close of the nineteenth century. A preliminary committee having this matter in hand has been organized in Bologna, with Count Aquaderni as chairman. The committee has addressed a communication to the Pope, in which the following program is unfolded:

"We purpose to organize an international committee and effect an early agitation of this proposal and to prepare the whole Catholic world to close the nineteenth century with a solemn and general act of gratitude toward Jesus Christ, our Savior, as also to give expression to our affection for and submission to His exalted Vicar, the Pope of Rome."

The Pope has responded to this appeal with a glad consent and has given the committee his apostolic blessing.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

OCTOBER, 1899.

No. 5.

THE CHURCH YEAR IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

It is not the place here and not necessary for our purpose to pursue the formation of the Church Year backward in order to see how the regulation of the Christian festival time within the sphere of the week was first fixed, afterwards extended to the year, how the three great festivals were first established, and between these finally after many vacillations, the individual Sundays received their special reference to the whole, and thereby their pericopes. It suffices for our purpose to take the Church Year as it was formed in the medieval Church, and then to see how the Church of the Reformation received it.

What at present in those German state churches, which have not in general given up the Church Year through the abrogation of the pericopes, yet remains of it, that is only a part of the old Church Year, and indeed that part which can be named in the narrowest sense the Year of the Lord, because it consists only of Sunday and festival days, therefore of days of the Lord only. Already in the ancient Church among these days of the Lord there were found a number of days of apostles, of Mary and of martyrs, and they had been given place between the days of the Lord. The foundation of the Church is the Lord; the apostles, the holy martyrs, the teachers, etc., are the pillars of the Church, which standing upon that foundation bear them. Portraying this—as the whole Church Year is a portrayal of history—the Church has placed these days of remembrance of her own people in the year of the Lord. One can name this second constituent of the year of God in contradistinction from the

first, the year of the Lord, the year of the Church in the strict sense, and say: the year of the Church has built itself upon the year of the Lord, as the Church is built upon Christ.

The second part of the Church Year was already right richly supplied when the Church entered into the middle ages. With that constituent of the Church Year which comprises the year of the Lord in the strict sense, the Church of the middle ages had little to do, and what she added to it is either dogmatically "impure," as the Corpus-Christi day, or based upon legends and superstition as the festival of the Lance and the Nails of Christ, or at least in opposition with the conception of a festival, as the festival of the dogma of the trinity, but always arbitrarily in the choice of the days of the year and not at all standing in connection in time with the other days of the Lord, yet through all these revealing their apocryphal nature. On the other hand the medieval Church gave to the second part of the Church Year an enormous development, and dotted the Church Year with holy days as the earth and heaven were peopled with saints. That this part of the Church Year increased with time was both natural and blameless, if one admits the principle of the ancient Church to keep remembrance days for her martyrs and witnesses to the truth. But this hunger after new saints which creates them when history furnishes none, and, not satisfied with the true honor belonging to the real historical Church heroes, invents sanctities which do not belong to them,—this excess can only be the result of the false principle according to which the medieval Church pushed herself and her inventions, especially her holy personages, into the place of the Lord. It is indeed a veritable truth, when the Lutheran polemic Kirchbauer, after he had described all this, sarcastically remarked: thus it was done "that it might not be necessary further to commit all to Christ." But not only, that the medieval Church set up days for saints whose services for the Church of God were entirely unknown to the Church,—the worst was, that out of that half principle an entirely false relation of this part of the Church Year to the proper year of the Lord arose. The ancient Church knew well how to keep both parts separate; she so arranged the year of the Lord that the festival and the individual days thereof stand to one another in the connection shown in the temporal, the historical course of the life of the Lord. On the other hand she so placed the saints' days between the days of the Lord, even those of the apostles, mostly guided in the choice of the days by contingencies, so that they did

not stand to them nor under them in any temporal and organic relation. One seeks in vain among these days after a regulated order, as the year of the Lord bears one; rather these days should have no order, but as individual plants of the Lord grow up out of the soil of the year of the Lord. Therefore the ancient Church marked the days of the Lord from these very distinctly by the character of the festival: those were festivals, these were saints' days (*Gedenktage*). This distinction the medieval Church abolished. But not in this way that they set up an organic union between these days and the days of the Lord, which was in itself impossible; though the presumption of the Romish Church herein manifested itself that she often changed the days which the old Western Church had fixed for the remembrance of the apostles and commoner saints to the days on which according to tradition the bones or other relics of saints were brought into their country. But she, as she put the saints in the place of Christ and prayed to them, etc., not only placed these remembrance days on a level with the festivals and days of the Lord, but against the Reformation exalted them through higher service; and this exaltation became the door through which the legends and lies entered to make the Church great in the riches of the saints and little in the glory of the Lord.

This was one of the points where that which Luther cited at the beginning of these articles, called "the other abuse," has its home. How fundamentally different was the way in which the two reformatory churches, the Lutheran and the Reformed, proceeded against them. The principles from which the Reformed Church started, are given us in the following passage from the Second Helvetic Confession, chapter 24: "Although religion is bound to no time, yet it cannot be taught and practiced without a proper division or regulation of time. Therefore every church adopts a fixed time for the public prayers and the preaching of the Gospel, as well as for the celebration of the Sacraments. It belongs in no way to any one's right to destroy the regulation of the Church according to his own pleasure. But it is not within the province of any one to destroy the arrangements of the Church according to his own pleasure. And if for the exercise of the outward religion there were no proper rest place provided, men would in most cases be kept from it through their business. We find therefore in the ancient Church that not only were certain hours in the week set apart for the assemblies, but that also from the time of the apostles on,

Sunday was hallowed for holy rest, which is also yet now with right held by our Church on account of divine service and love. Therefore we give no place to the observance and the superstitious conceptions of the Jews. We hold one day to be no holier than another, neither are we of the opinion that God calls rest good in itself; but we hallow the Sunday and not the Sabbath out of free veneration. When in addition the churches, according to Christian liberty, reverently celebrate the remembrance of the birth, the circumcision, the suffering and the resurrection and also the ascension of Christ, and the sending of the Holy Ghost to the disciples; we also favor this very earnestly. But the festivals which are dedicated to men or saints we do not favor. And without doubt the holy days belong to the first table of the law, and pertain alone to God; finally the holy days devoted to the saints and abrogated by us contain very much inappropriate, useless and unendurable. We confess, however, that the remembrance of the saints in the proper place and at the right time can be recommended to the people in preaching, and the blessed examples of the good should be commended to all for imitation."

When the passage opens with the opinion that "religion is bound to no time," this opinion only then has truth, if one understands by religion the exercise of religion, singing and praying, devotional exercises and adoration. If one by the word thinks of religion itself and its origin, then religion, according to Reformed view, would be something bound to time, because something arising through historical manifestation in time. This point the Reformed Church leaves entirely out of view; she apprehends the Church days not from the objective side, as the days when God accomplished the individual deeds of salvation, but from the subjective side as the days on which we remember such deeds. Thus that passage itself calls the great festivals not the days when God gave the world His Son, raised Him up, etc., but the days of our reverent remembrance of the "birth," etc. But if these days are only days of our celebration and remembrance, and the latter determines the former, then it is, not indeed the right of the individual church member, but truly the right of the Church freely to designate the days of these celebrations according to number, date, etc. There would then be no more given days of the Lord, but the Church "chooses" her times; this choice, as the conception of choice brings with it, is something relatively arbitrary, and must seek its determining periods in the matter in outward mo-

tives, e. g.; in this, that "men through their business be not kept from the exercise of outward religion"; and thus naturally the one congregation would have this and the other congregation that choice. Yea, in fact there is no need of such days, as a Christian should think of such things daily. But finally since the Church days are not so much days of the Lord, as rather foundations of the Church, there was no difference to be fixed between the days of the old Church Year, but the days making the proper year of the Lord were sunk down to the signification which the ancient Church attributed to her days of remembrance; as also the above passage does not discriminate between the conception "festival day," "hour of prayer," etc., but puts them together under the common concept "holy day" and "day of rest." When therefore the Reformed Church approached the Church Year of the medieval Church with such predisposition, nothing remained to her than to put away the entire last half of the Church Year, the days of the apostles with the impure saints' days. She could no longer have these properly follow the true days of the Lord, since she had reduced the signification of the latter to the sense of remembrance days. Thus the Reformed Church lost the year of the Church built upon the year of the Lord, because under her conception the year of the Lord became the year of the Church.

In consistent procedure therefore the Basel KO. (Church order) abolished all the days of the apostles, of John the Baptist, etc., with all saints' days. The days of their remembrance shall remain fixed "in the calendar," and, where there is weekday services, shall be treated in earnest remembrance. So the Cassel KO. of 1539, the KO. of Count-palatine Frederick on the Rhine of the year 1569, no longer mentions them.

But these principles, together with the abstract biblical principle, must still further lead to a lessening of the year of the Lord. To these belong also the festivals of our Lady, which, as we shall see below, were first according to the medieval view festivals of our Lady, but according to the conception of the ancient Church were properly festivals of the Lord. In the interest of opposition the Reformed Church conceived them as festivals of our Lady, to have a sufficient reason to do with them as with the apostles' days. But when in the Church days in general only the subjective side of devotion came into consideration, and when further the historical consideration, which was given to each Sunday in the development of the ancient Church Year, had no importance; it was near at hand to take away the value of all the

Sundays coming between the great festivals of Christ, which they had in the Church Year. And when finally the principle of subjective freedom drew along the abrogation of the pericopes calculated upon the Church Year, when, instead of these free texts were allowed, and thus in the liturgical parts of the divine service every specific reference to the idea of days was made impossible; there remained then of the whole Church Year nothing more than the three great festivals of the Lord as days of remembrance. The Reformed Church followed out these consequences fearlessly. Those three mentioned KOO. (Church orders) and with them the whole Reformed Church of Switzerland and Germany, appoint, except the Sundays, only Christmas, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost. Not even Good Friday. The Cassel has not even Ascension. On the contrary, New Year indeed appears, but not as in all other churches as the festival of the Circumcision of Christ, but as "New Year" or "New Year's Day." Also for this festival only a one day celebration was ordered, since Zwingli and Calvin held one day to be sufficient. All other festivals were referred to the weekday services. The pericopes were wholly abolished. Even for the festivals retained it was only required that a remembrance of the fact of the festival occur; the preacher is no way bound to the festival Gospel. It is appropriate to their unionistic character when the KO. of Count-palatine Frederick recommended the preservation of the historical pericopes for those festivals.

On the other hand it is again entirely consistent, since the Reformed Church is the home of the days of repentance and prayer, when she instead of the abolished year of the Lord substituted the days of repentance and prayer in every month, yea in many parts in every week without historical connecting link for the expression of subjective Christian experience, and when yet even to the present day the Berne Country Church holds the day of prayer falling in September as a festival of the greatest honor, even as we hold Good Friday. Thus the Reformed Church in putting the sacramental behind the sacrificial has lost the year of the Lord with its objective facts and words in its sacrificial sermons, memorials and prayers, and has thereby fallen into an error opposite to the Römissh error. For the Romish Church has the outward and dead history herself, and the Reformed has its inner vivacity; but neither comes out decidedly from its own to the objective word and work of the Lord.

The Lutheran Church from other principles arrived at

an entirely different result. She started also here with the distinction between the sacramental and sacrificial in divine service. This was already in relation to the purpose the situation which she thought as underlying all celebrations of Sundays and festival days. When, e. g., in view of the above cited passage of the Helvetic Confession, the Reformed Church considered these days set apart for the preaching of the Word and the celebration of the Sacraments, the Lutheran Church, on the contrary, constantly affirmed that they were set apart for the hearing of the Word and for the use of the Sacraments. But also in the whole comprehension of these days and in the distinctions made between them this principle again appeared. If one in the Lutheran Church of the sixteenth century had spoken of a harvest festival, mission festival, etc., such language would not have been understood, or at least would have been called Catholicizing. Those days, which the Church herself made, in order to render her words of thanksgiving, prayer and adoration for this or that, were called simply days; a festival to her was only that day which God had made. She censured the Romish Church, that she made festivals, and deduced therefrom the corruption, that she did not hold fast to God's Word. Festive and outward forms were instituted concerning the service of God for the sake of the common people, that when they are engaged in them they may not invent festivals according to their own desires. For nature is inclined, even restless to institute outward forms and to invent divine services; therefore it is necessary to stand before the people and hold them to God's Word, that we may be certain that we deal with divine things and render God service. Luther 3, 2219. As little as man can make sacraments, which require divine institution, just so little can man invent festivals, which have rather an historical act of salvation by God for a necessary presupposition. Indeed they are seldom referred to a divine appointment; and the Lauenburg KO. stands alone when it rests the obligation to observe Sunday and festivals upon the divine institution of the Sabbath, Paschal Lamb, etc., in the old covenant. Rather the Lutheran stood firmly in opposition to the Romish opus operatum that the difference between free Christian celebration of festivals and the Jewish ordained by God for the education of His people must be clearly distinguished. Of this she held only the more firmly, that at all times she more deeply recognized than the Reformed Church the necessity of ceremonies in general and of appointed days for divine service.

for the edifying of the people, and that every time after her declaration concerning the freedom of the Christian she added in a special way this restriction. Thus Luther continued after he cited Gal. 4, 10: "Yet the Church has preserved some festivals on account of the imperfect, for whom the Word of God is necessary. To a true, upright man there is no difference, all days are alike to him, as with God there is no regard of days, cities and persons. Nevertheless these are none the less necessary to the weak in whom the old man is not yet dead, that they exercise themselves in appointed divine services, days, customs, watches, fasts, labors, prayer, discipline, etc., that they may increase in growth in the inner man." 3, 1787. Therefore she inculcates so decidedly that the day in itself has no special holiness, and that the date has nothing depending on it. "But this, I say, is not so limited to any time, as with the Jews, that it must be just on this or that day; for in itself no one day is better than another." Larger Cat., p. 402, § 85. She knows very well that the placing of the birthday of the Lord upon the 25th of December wants a historical foundation, and yet has not objected to the celebration of Christmas upon this day, and to the calculation of the festivals connected with Christmas. What she wishes in regard to the celebration of the festivals with her historical principle, is certainly this: it is not narrowness to the Church and her desired choice to fix a day for her devotion and pious exercises; but since these subjective emotions and participation of the congregation must have a special object, for which she offers thanks, adoration and prayer, so must a fact and indeed a fact according to the nature of the thing from the circle of God's gracious deeds for salvation underly these days as the object for the offerings of the congregation. The Church therefore cannot make a festival day, but she searches the history of the revelation of God, recognizes within this, e. g., the birth of the Lord, as a momentous development in this history and now appoints a day to which this factor gives the festival character. Therefore it is entirely indifferent whether the day of celebration hits the date on which that gracious deed of God in reality occurred; it suffices for the Church to know that the Lord really accomplished this deed of salvation, and that He is ready at every hour in the words telling of this deed as in His Word to enter into her assembly, to produce in her continually the blessings of this gracious deed; and she has therefore to care only for the one thing, that in her

divine service the reference to these gracious deeds of God and the words setting forth these deeds are not absent.

What therefore constitutes a festival is not alone the impetus of the Church to worship, etc., but besides or rather before this sacrificial moment also the sacramental moment of the reference of the day to the holy history and its consecration through a suitable word of God; yea, this sacramental moment is the primitive, which through its signification, power and working 'begets and awakes the thanksgiving, petitions and prayers, the whole sacrificial acts of the congregation, and upon which therefore the latter as upon its center rests; and hence one must say that a day is not made holy by preaching, praying, etc., but through the work and Word of God constituting it. "But God's Word is the treasury which sanctifies everything whereby all the saints themselves were sanctified. Whatever be the hour when God's Word is taught, preached, heard, read or meditated upon, person, day and work are then sanctified thereby, not because of the external work, but because of the Word, which makes saints of us all." *Larger Cat.*, p. 403.

Upon the foundation of such principles the Lutheran Church stands with free and firm judgment over against the Church Year of the medieval Church: she did not need, as the Reformed, out of fear of losing her identity, to cast away the same and thus to give the right away with the wrong; rather she had a base of clear perception from which she could distinguish and separate the pure from the impure. Those her principles were none other than those out of which the ancient Church originally had formed the Church Year. The old Church Year was retained in the medieval and only overgrown with impure addition; therefore there was no hindrance, after discarding the latter, in appropriating those sound foundations. The process of decision was easily carried out according to the canon, that a religious day must have for its basis the work and Word of God. She retains therefore necessarily the pericopes. Already in the history of revelation, as of the old as well as of the new covenant, there was the arrangement that always along with the divine deed of salvation went the divine Word explaining and announcing this deed: Moses had his Aaron, to the sign and miracle the prophetic word always belonged, the proving in signs and teaching makes the prophet, and the high priest of the world is the light and teacher of the world. This arrangement according to the judgment of the ancient Church should continue in the kingdom of the Lord, and she or-

dered that in the Church Year sharing this history of revelation always along with the deed of salvation giving to the day this signification should go the Word of Scripture declaring this deed of salvation; and just through the reading of such Scripture words enters the salvation—act of the day livingly and actually into the hearing congregation. The medieval Church retained the pericopes there where the ancient Church had already placed them, and only in the new festivals first introduced by her did she apply and preach instead of sections of the Scripture words of the Church and legends, on the oldest days of divine service at most beside the biblical pericope introduced the legends also in the sermon. The Lutheran Church examined the lections of the days coming in the medieval Church, and the days which had a biblical fact with a word of Scripture with it she retained along with the pericope, while the days with "impure" texts she rejected. Already in the year 1523 in the pamphlet "Of the Order of Divine Service in the Congregation" Luther applied this principle, though not in full consistency.

Thus the Church Year of the ancient Church again appeared in the Lutheran Church, and this historical preservation should henceforth as a chief factor keep her from error. When a festival arose through the underlying of a fact of a historical deed of salvation, it was not impossible, since the historical act was connected with a history comprising many centuries whose individual points might each be made the center of a religious day, to arrive at a great number of festivals and holy days. The medieval Church lost itself with the form of her festivals in the *opus operatum*: she offered therein little to the congregation and occupies it not at all; and yet through church discipline and in its union with the secular arm she holds firmly over entire days without labor to her many festivals and holy days. The result was that the people out of idleness fell into disorderly and evil ways. Thus a wail from statesmen, lawyers and wage-earners runs through the fifteenth century, that the excess of festival days destroyed the morals of the people. The Reformation joined in this complaint. Nearly in all Reformed confessions and Church orders there is such a passage. Also Luther himself says, obviously in his private capacity: "Would to God that there was no festival day in the Church, except Sunday, that our Lady and all holy feasts were put on Sunday; thus much evil would be avoided, through labor of these days the people would not be so poor. Now we are plagued with many

holidays to the destruction of souls, body and goods, of which much could be said."

In fundamental opposition he says, jeering the Romish extension of the Church Year through the festivals of the saints: "If we have done nothing else, yet we have instituted new festivals and have displaced the old with the new; that is worthy of eternal remembrance. I believe it will come to pass that a festival to Abraham will be desired; for his faith is the beginning of salvation, and to him Christ was first promised. And if God had not promised it to him, Christ would not have been born. And perhaps afterwards it will descend to Adam and Eve, that a day be given to them." 3, 1751. The question is concerning a principle of reduction. The Reformed Church, having no principle, came from this point to the giving up of the whole Church Year. But the Lutheran Church had for the above this principle: she accepted no more festivals than those among the days in use which had pure texts and deeds; therefore returned to the small number of the ancient Church and did not commit the error of casting away what of right and with blessed fruit lived in the hearts of the people. True she did not accept in many places, as we shall see later, all the holidays which would stand before this principle, because of local reasons; but nowhere and never did she receive more festival days than allowed by that rule.

If it was in this mentioned case the historical principle which regulated the application of the scriptural principle, it was on the contrary the scriptural principle which preserved the application of the historical from error in the following case. The Reformed Church had reasons to discard the year of the Church which had been placed into the year of the Lord, because she in her sacrificial conception of the latter was not able to give the former a properly adjusted setting. The Lutheran Church in her sacramental estimation of the year of the Lord could do this, and therefore on principle could not object to the introduction of the year of the Church. With regard to the Romish misuse in the manner of celebration of these days she was content with the declaration, that on the day of an apostle, etc., praise, prayer and remembrance did not belong to the man but to the Lord who had given him to the Church. The question was only in regard to the principle according to which the infinity of impure Romish saints could be dispensed with. But this was soon found in that that only those from the Romish saints were retained whose persons and texts were

biblical. Thus were kept the days of the apostles, the legends which had gathered around them were discarded, and the biblical pericopes were preserved. But the apostles in a special sense were pillars in the Church; and upon this foundation the Church was built, richly ornamented with witnesses and martyrs, and not simply groveling here in the dust but one with the Church of saints and angels in heaven. There was before the apostles and even before the Lord Himself a church which hoped in Him and in its hope testified of Him and pointed to Him. Who represents this better than John the Baptist, the greatest among the prophets? Thus the day of John the Baptist remained, all the more because it in such a conception was a festival of Christ. There was also one holy Church of God, consisting of saints, men and angels; and according to the above citations the Lutheran Church believes she is not only approaching it, but in her assembly is an image and type of it. Who represents this triumphant congregation, living in the eternal praise of the Lord, better than the archangel Michael, "one of the chiefest of angelic princes," whose existence the Scriptures declare? Thus the day of St. Michael remains. Finally there is the Church passing in time under the cross and in her the witnesses to martyrdom and to truth, whom the Lord raised up for her preservation. These have been represented partly by Stephen, partly by the Innocents, and not seldom by the holy Laurentius, a Romish deacon of the third century, who died as a martyr, and therefore one of these three remained in some of the Lutheran Churches. In this trinity of churchly saints' days, together with the days of the apostles, the year of the Church in the strict sense closes in Lutheran observance; if one yet adds that not a few Lutheran Churches in remembrance of the female part of the congregation and of the Word of the Lord, Matt. 26, 13, retains the day of Mary Magdalena. We will soon see how this year of the Church is placed back of the year of the Lord. Here mention need be made only that this shows itself in a much freer treatment, since many Lutheran Churches receive more, and many, less of these days; and that in agreement with the ancient Church no effort was made to place these days into a union with the year of the Lord; but the Lutheran Church permitted these days without organic connection to stand within the year of the Lord.

After this fundamental discussion we will set forth the Lutheran Church Year itself, by giving the number of religious days received in the different divisions of the Church.

and then by unfolding the signification which the Lutheran Church gives to the whole and to the individual part.

With unanimity all Lutheran Churches celebrate Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension and Whitsunday; and indeed Easter and Whitsunday and also Christmas with three days of festival, for only by way of exception the second Christmas day has the pericope of St. Stephen's day and the third Christmas day that of the day of John the Evangelist. In the rule the Christmas pericopes supplant these days, and the KOO. speak generally with Luther in the Formula missae: "Instead of the festivals of St. Stephen and of John the Evangelist it would please us if one would keep the entire service of the holy Christmas days." These celebrations of the so-called great festivals, lasting three days, in honor of the holy Trinity, are kept in the churches of the pure Lutheran type, as one is kept in the purely Reformed type. Only the United South German Churches, as the KOO. of Otthemrich, the Baden-Hochbergische, etc., have a two-day festival. That has neither reason nor meaning; but it is union, as sure as two lies between one and three. Further all Lutheran Churches have the festival of Sunday; and there is no doubt, after what has been said concerning the principles, that they do not look upon them, even in Sundays of the Trinity period, merely as days of adoration and religious worship. Rather Sundays pass with them as days of the Lord, each one endowed with its own historical Word of the Lord, in which Word the Lord makes continuously effective in His Church the deed related there. Only the United KOO., as those of Landgrave Frederic on the Rhein, content themselves in prescribing for the festivals proper the historical gospels according to the Lutheran order, on the contrary they leave the ordinary Sundays in accord with Reformed usage without pericopes, as sacrificial days without sacramental substratum.

It is obvious that the Lutheran Church should be inclined to retain, besides the great festivals and common Sundays, not only the festivals of the second grade, placed between the great festivals, but also perseveringly to proceed in the way and manner in which the ancient Church had placed the Sundays preceding and following the great festivals in conjunction with them. This last occurred simply through the preservation of the pericopes. On the contrary through the former procedure there arose a series of independent, weekday festivals, namely the festival of Circumcision of the Lord, Epiphany, Maundy-Thursday, and

the three days of our Lady, of purification, annunciation and visitation of Mary. All Church orders of the home of Lutheranism have these six festival days. Only a few among the United do not have them, as Landgrave Frederic on the Rhein. The festival of visitation is sometimes absent, e. g., in the Wurtemberg of 1586, in the Nordheimer of 1538, in the Prussian of 1558, and in the Baden Hochbergischen. The United show their mediation mostly in the form of the festival. With the exception of Maundy-Thursday, to which even old and good Lutheran KOO., e. g., the Lüneburg, Celle and Lauenburg, give only a half-day festival, all mentioned festivals have a whole day celebration in all strict Lutheran KOO. On the contrary they are in the United KOO., either, as in the Strassburg in 1598, placed on a weekday or as the Wurtemberg of 1536 observed with only a half-day celebration, with the exception of New Year's day, which loses its signification as a festival of Circumcision and keeps only that of New Year's day. There is nothing more to be said here of the festivals of Circumcision and of Maundy-Thursday; and of Epiphany falling on the 6th of January only this, that the Lutheran Church would rather so call it than the festival of the three holy kings, a name recalling the Romish legends. On the other hand something general can here be said concerning the festivals of Mary. The festivals of our Lady held in the Lutheran Church are not originally festivals of Mary, but properly festivals of Christ, and owe their origin to the dogmatic conceptions which agitated the Church in the Nestorian controversies. Later, as the worship of saints on the one hand and the over valuation of single life on the other pressed with fervor into the Church these festivals were changed from festivals of the Lord into actual festivals of Mary; and it is known how many and manifold elements were comprised in Mary and her worship as the same were impressed upon the apprehension of the German people with its feeling of domestic sentiment, with its veneration of the feminine as a priestly sex, with its knightly and poetic courtesy. While now through all these influences the number of festivals of Mary were signally increased (birth, ascension and immaculate conception) the Lutheran Church was obliged to apply here her principle of scripturalness and of churchly antiquity. Before it fell naturally the last named and yet many others, because they rested on historic and dogmatic fiction. The three first remained, because they had biblical texts and facts; and it remained to conceive them in their original

sense as festivals of Christ. That the Lutheran KOO. did expressly, and easily returned to purification and annunciation. Luther already designated these two as festivals of Christ: "The festivals of purification and annunciation we hold as festivals of Christ, Epiphany and Circumcision." 10, 2753. According to the Brunswick KO. of 1528 this festival should be celebrated, "not for the sake of the day but for the sake of the preacher, since the histories are comprised in the Gospels and concern our Lord Jesus Christ."

More particularly is purification universally reckoned with the days concerning the birth of Christ; of annunciation the Lauenburg KO. says that it "more appropriately might be called the festival of the conception or incarnation of Christ."

It was more difficult to prove of the visitation that it is a festival of the Lord. Commonly the KOO. rest on the argument that its history is biblical; only the Austrian KO. of 1571 attempts a dogmatic reason, when it says: "the visitatio Marie is the first synodus of the New Testament, wherein the article of our faith, 'conceived of the virgin Mary,' was announced by Mary and Elizabeth and revealed to the Church in the glorious hymn Magnificat." Luke 1, 46-55. This is also the reason, as we have seen above, that this festival has not found universal acceptance. Moreover purification fell upon the 2d of February, forty days after the 25th of December, according to Lev. 12, 1ff.; and Luke 2, 22, while annunciation which properly stands on the 25th of March, nine months before December 25, could readily fall on Palm Sunday or in holy week. The entrance of this festival belonging to the birth of the Lord in the holy week in general and often the celebration on Palm Sunday was considered unsuitable, and therefore should in this case "according to ancient custom, that at this time the holy suffering and resurrection of Christ might be uninterruptedly preached," according to some KOO. be transferred to the Sunday Quasimodogeniti; according to others to Saturday evening before Palm Sunday and according to others to Palm Sunday itself. Thus it generally came in the time of Lent. How in this case the sense of this Christmas-like festival can be combined with the thoughts of Lent the almost universally received collect for annunciation shows. "We thank Thee,—that Thou hast sent Thy Son in our flesh as a comfort to us poor sinners, and permitted Him to become man: and we pray Thee, that Thou through Thy Holy Spirit wouldest make us partakers in His incarnation,

suffering and death, that we may know and receive Him as our Lord and eternal King," etc. The festival of visitation falls on July 2; for if Elizabeth had gone six months at the time of the annunciation, Luke 1, 26, and Mary visited Elizabeth in the days of the announcement, v. 39, and remained with her three months, v. 56, and Elizabeth's time came immediately after, then, annunciation accepted on March 25, the end of the visit, "the first Synod of the New Testament," must fall in the beginning of July.

To these festivals of the second order the Trinity festival also belongs. It is known that this is of later origin and that taken strictly as a dogma festival it does not fill the conception of a festival. Nevertheless the Lutheran has universally received it as a festival of the Holy Trinity; apparently as well over against the Romish as the anti-Trinitarians to confess her adherence to the old fundamental dogma of the Church. How she at the same time gave this festival a wider signification, when she, in opposition to the Romish Church which gave this festival the baptismal formula as the pericope, gave back the old pericope of Nicodemus, we will learn later.

* * * * *

When we pass to the other part of the year of God we meet first the days of the apostles. The order of these, when we follow the course of the Church Year, is this: Day of Andrew, November 30; of Thomas, December 21; of John the Evangelist, December 27; of Matthias, February 24; of Philip and James, May 1; of Peter and Paul, June 29; of James, July 25; of Bartholomew, August 24; of Matthew, September 21; of Simon and Judas, October 28. While the Reformed abolished these days or at most left them free to be remembered in the weekday preaching, they were accepted by all the Lutheran Churches of Germany, even by those which inclined to the Reformed. These did thus; instead of individual apostle days, they celebrated one day for all. In Protestant lands there were seldom more than the enumerated apostle days kept. Paul's Conversion and Peter's Chains are mentioned in only one KO.; but the manner in which they were observed differed greatly.

Concerning other days of the Year of the Church we find in general use only the day of John the Baptist and of Michael, in which the first never, the last only in the Wittenberg territory, fails. Both days are celebrated all day, the first on June 24th, the second on Sept. 29th.

There were many voices in the Church for the day of Mary Magdalena, July 22nd, which was helped by its biblical character. Still less but yet many good authorities mention the day of Laurentius, August 10th, and place it almost equal to the Apostles' days. The day of Stephen has something in its favor because of its biblical character, if the second Christmas day had not supplanted it, as it comes on Dec. 26th. Also All Saints' day appears, but generally in catholizing KOO; it comes on Nov. 1st. The days of the Beheading of John, Aug. 29th, of Catharine, Nov. 25th, and of the Innocents, Dec. 28th, have few and not always good advocates. We see below that the pericopes of the last, fitting very well the Christmas Cycle, are given to a Sunday between Christmas and New Year.

As the Apostles' and Saints' days do not stand in connection with the order of the Year of the Lord, we will say here what yet remains to be said. The divine services of all of these days were burdened in the medieval church with legends in texts and liturgy; they must be purified according to Luther's expression. It was chiefly through him that they received and kept the same pericopes and collects in all Lutheran churches. They are:

Andrew: Matt. 4, 18-22 and Rom. 10, 10-18.

Thomas: John 20, 24-29 and Eph. 1, 3-7.

John the Evangelist was displaced by the third Christmas day.

Matthias: Matt. 11, 25-30, or 19, 27-30, and Acts 1, 15-26.

Philip and James: John 14, 1-13 and Eph. 2, 19-22; or Wisdom of Solomon 5, 1-14.

Peter and Paul: Matt. 16, 13-20 and Acts 12, 1-11.

James: Matt. 20, 20-28 and Rom. 8, 28-58.

Bartholomew: Luke 22, 24-30 and 2 Cor. 4, 7-10.

Matthew: Matt. 9, 9-13 and Eph. 4, 7-14 and 1 Cor. 12, 4-11.

Simon and Judas: Jno. 15, 17-25 and 1 Pet. 1, 3-9.

Paul's Conversion: Matt. 19, 23-30 and Acts 9, 1-22; or Acts 9, 1-22 and 1 Tim. 1, 14-17.

A slight observance of these pericopes shows that wherever possible the gospel brings a preserved, leading feature from the life of the Apostle and the epistle gives us the doctrine from it. The examination of all will teach how perfectly therein the affairs of the Church and the duties, joys and comforts of the Christian, connected there-

with, are set forth. Here also the Acts are used as pericopes, from which since the acceptance of Apostles days so little has been preached; it also shows how the church gives preëminence to the Gospels, since the evangelical pericope holds the place of the Gospel, even when the Acts gives the proper history of the day and the gospel must perform the didactic functions.

Under the wider remembrance days John the Baptist takes Luke 1, 58-79, or Luke 1, 57-66 and Isa. 40, 1-5, or Luke 1, 67-79. It especially pleases the Lutheran Church that on this day the hymn of Zacharias, Luke 1, 67-79, be explained to the congregation, which hymn in liturgical treatment bears the name of Benedictus, and of which the Lutheran Church, as we shall see, makes a wide liturgical use. On this account a number of KOO. declare that they value this day not only as a day for John, but rather as a festival for Christ. The day Michael has Matt. 18, 1-11 and Rev. 12, 7-12.

Mary Magdalena has Luke 7, 36-50 and Eph. 2, 3-7. or 1 Tim. 1, 15-17.

Laurentius: John 12, 24-26 or Acts 6, 1-6 and 2 Cor. 9, 6-11.

All Saints' day: Math. 5, 1-12 and Rev. 7, 9-17 or Wisdom of Solomon 3, 1-10.

Beheading of John: Mark 6, 17-29, and Wisdom of Solomon, 5, 1-7.

The Innocents: Matt. 2, 13-18 and Rev. 14, 1-5. In these texts the Apocalypse receives honor and use.

In this riches which the Lutheran Church gives her religious year, it appears astonishing, and yet agrees properly with her principles, that she in the first century was very poor in religious days of a marked sacrificial character. While, as we saw above, the Reformed Church ordered a monthly or weekly day of prayer, while the United KOO., e. g., the Strasburg, the Cassel, imitate therein the Reformed Church, the same appears under the strict Lutheran type only in the form either to give to one of the week day services (which then preserves intact its Bible lection and exegeses of it) through the preservation of the litany and other liturgical forms of prayer, the signification of a day of repentance and prayer, or that, as ordered by the Rev. Meckl. KO., to appropriate the Apostles' days for days of prayer through the increase of those liturgical parts.

The Lutheran Church was never sparing with prayer; but the sacrificial should and dared appear only with the sacramental. Other religious days of a sacrificial character, except New Year's day, which is a festival of the circumcision, were injected into the Church year, appearing sporadically, and then so that such sacrificial signification supports itself on a historico-dogmatic signification of the day. Thus there appeared almost a universal desire for a harvest-festival; but only the United Strasburg KO. so formulated it that in every fall the preachers by agreement appointed a text, and by preaching on the same upon a Sunday after St. Michael should celebrate harvest festival. Less frequently it happened that harvest festival was appointed on the day of St. Michael. The occasion for it was the mediating thought that God vouchsafed His protection and blessings through His holy angel. Thus the Prussian KO. of 1558 says: On which (St. Michael) day praise, thanksgiving and glory should be given to our merciful God for the manifold blessings and favors shown to us unworthy people, both bodily and spiritual, especially for the clemency and great goodness in that He appointed the holy angels for us poor sinful men, in an invisible manner to preserve and keep, to guard and protect us, and that they should be our guardians according to the will and order of God; and especially for the gracious gifts of the fruits and reaped harvests." The form of the festival is described in the Wolfenb. KO. in the words: "On St. Michael's day the doctrine of the holy angels should be declared to the people. Also at the same festival after the Epistle is read, a common thanksgiving shall be made and the Te Deum laudamus be sung." The Lauenb. KO. orders that on the Sunday after St. Michael, when the sermon on the regular pericope has been held, the preacher, with the people, shall offer a harvest festival prayer and then sing the Te Deum. This Lau. KO. has a day of prayer before the harvest festival: On Friday before Cantate divine service shall be held, in which first a hymn of intercession be sung, then a sermon upon a passage speaking of God's providential care, then a prayer for the preservation of the State, and then to be closed with the singing of the Litany; the whole is called Fegelfeier. St. Michael's Day, through its gospel, through the position which it places the angels to the children, and through its position in the year at the beginning of the winter solstice, offers sufficient occasion to serve in many places as

a churchly school festival. Also the signification which the fact of the Reformation has for the Church of God appeared very early to make necessary a churchly thanksgiving. Very different were the arrangements for this Reformation festival. The country churches first called for the establishment of a Reformation day, which, as the Pomeranian, chose the day of Martin the Bishop, though the Bishop got this honor on account of Luther. The day obtained for pericopes: Luke 12, 55-48 and Rev. 14, 6-7, and the Pomeranian liturgy the following instructions: "On this day every year the whole congregation shall be admonished to give thanks to God that He in these last days has raised up His servant, Dr. Martin Luther, who is the angel which flew through heaven with the everlasting gospel. He was born on Martin's day in the year 1483; and on Martin's day in the wake of All Saints, 1517, he began publicly to teach against the papacy, and he fell asleep in the year 1546 in February on the day Concordiae. Therefore all Christendom should thank God eternally, distinguish his doctrine from the false doctrine and abominations of the antichrist, and on this day the Word of God should be preached, which is the office of a Christian bishop and pastor." Others are marked by different historical circumstances. In lower Saxony the Reformation was first celebrated in the Summer. The Lauenburg KO. prescribes that on the first Sunday after St. John day the congregation be called upon after the sermon to render thanksgiving and prayer and then to sing the Te Deum. In this Lauenb. KO. we also find a day for the remembrance of the introduction of Christianity. Lauenburg recognized in the Abbot Answerus at Ratzeburg, † 1066, the man who, through his missionary activity after the preceding labors, especially of Ansgar, founded the Christian Church in those regions. It was therefore always held on the day of his martyrdom, the 15th of July. The Protestant KO. orders that always on the Sunday after the day of Answerus the congregation be reminded of it, thanksgiving for redemption from heathendom be offered and then the Te Deum be sung.

All of these days — to emphasize it by recapitulation — in the sixteenth and seventeenth century were celebrated in Mecklenburg as follows: Christmas, Easter and Whitsunday with a three-day festival; all Sundays, Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification, Annunciation, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Ascension, Trinity, John the Bap-

tist, Visitation, St. Michael with a whole-day festival; with a half-day festival the days of the Apostles Andrew, Thomas, Matthias, Philip and James, Peter and Paul, James, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Judas; finally in the week-day services the days should be remembered, which are not specially celebrated and yet whose histories are written in the Gospel, namely the days of the Innocents, of the Conversion of Paul, of Mary Magdalena, of the beheading of John; and the apostles' days, through the singing of hymns of repentance and the Litany, should be held as days of repentance and prayer.

We have yet the task to go through the proper year of the Lord in its divisions, and set forth how the Lutheran Church conceived, received or modified the arrangement of it, received from the ancient Church. There is sufficient help not only in the pericopes, but also in the collects and hymns appointed by the liturgies for the individual days, in which the signification attributed to the day is clearly and sharply declared.

Advent was in the ancient Church a time of fasting. Of which only the prohibition of weddings and public amusements on account of known dogmatic grounds remains in the Lutheran Church. They have retained the old lections which the Comes already had. They are the same as in the hymn book of the Mecklenburg Church, and as in our own hymnal. Changes in these lections never appear. The signification of Advent in general is, waiting for the coming of the Lord, this coming taken in the three-fold sense: His coming into the world, His daily coming to us, and His return to judgment. These three points are comprised in the collects and the hymns appointed for Advent, as well as in the pericopes; and are there when some KOO. recommend to choose for the week-day sermons of Advent not only the Old Testament prophecies, but also the prophecies and preaching of Christ concerning the last days. The KO. of Ottheinrich aptly gives the reason for the preaching of the Old Testament prophecies: "That the Church thereby be instructed that our Christian faith is not self-grown or a faith conceived by man, but from the beginning of the world revealed by God, and confirmed by truly divine miracles." The Lutheran conception is conformable to the ancient one.

For the Christmas days, as for all great festivals, the old lectionaries have a number of pericopes because they

yet have the vigils. Since one Lutheran KO. took from these different pericopes from what the others took, a great number have arisen, which is further increased because some hold fast the holy days of St. Stephen and St. John. Others removed them through the Christmas lections. As Christmas gospels there are : Luke 2, 1-14; Jno. 1, 1-14; Luke 2, 15-20; and as Epistles: Isa. 9, 2-7; Tit. 2, 11-14; Tit. 3, 4-7; besides these also the pericopes of St. Stephen's day: Matt. 23, 34-39 and Acts 6, 8-7, 59. Thus besides the two passages from the letter of Titus, only such as are found in the old lectionaries. The division of these passages upon the different Christmas days is different in the different liturgies. What the conception of the Lutheran Church is of the Christmas festival and that it agrees with the ancient Church, needs no explanations.

With Christmas there goes a Christmas-cycle, consisting of Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification, Annunciation and Visitation. Circumcision has the common gospel, Luke 2, 21 and as the common Epistle Gal. 3, 23-29; which the Comes already had. The signification of the day of the year descending from heathendom and the circumcision of the Lord later (but not much later), both helped to put the festival into the Church Year. The Lutheran Church received both significations, while the Reformed held only that of the day of the year; in the circumcision of the Lord she finds the beginning of the active obedience, the going under the law for us, and connects this thought with the obedience which we ought to render in the New Year, as she in the New Year collect prays: "We thank Thee that Thou hast put Thy Son under the law for us sinners, that He with His perfect obedience might still Thy just wrath and heal our disobedience, and pray Thee, enlighten our hearts through Thy Holy Spirit, that we may comfort ourselves with such obedience against our sins and evil conscience, and in faith and true holiness and justification begin and finish the new year."

Epiphany has the common Gospel Matt. 2, 1-12, and Epistle Isa. 60, 1-6, the old pericopes which the Comes has. The meaning of the festival, the collects thus give, that the Lord is revealed to the heathen and to us, and we walk faithfully according to His light and for such treasure gladly do without and give all earthly good.

Purification has generally the old pericopes, Luke 2, 22-32, and Mal. 3, 1-4. Instead of the Epistle Jer. 23, 5-6, also comes, which the old lectionaries do not have. The Church lays upon the heart that on this day Simeon's song of praise is peached to the congregation, of whose liturgical treatment, the so-called *Nunc dimittis*, she makes so much use. (Luke 2, 29-32). This festival, because it is separated forty days from Christmas, falls outside of the Christmas days, into the days whose pericopes are taken from the prophetic life of the Lord. But we will see that the Lutheran Church by mistake reckons it still in the Christmas cycle. Therefore we do not find, as with the annunciation, the attempt through the collect to institute a likeness between the festival and the strange Church time in which it falls; but the collect names simply the fact of the day and adds the prayer that we may take the Lord spiritually in our arms as Simeon did bodily.

Annunciation has in common, the pericopes Luke 1, 26-38, and Isa. 7, 10-16. How the collects combine the signification of this festival of the incarnation of Christ with the Lenten time in which it generally falls, is above already shown.

Visitation has the Gospels Luke 1, 39-56, and Jno. 11, 1-5. As Epistle Rom. 12, 9-21 also appears. As this festival falls in the Trinity period whose pericopes and historical signification in general have no definite order, but rather favor the entrance of individual points, the collects do not attempt an equalization in this festival; rather they are content to place Mary before us as an example of Christian virtue or to draw a lesson from visitation. The main point to the Church was that the hymn of praise by Mary, Luke 1, 46-55, be expounded to the congregation, since she in the liturgical arrangement of it under the name *Magnificat* makes constant use of it in her divine service.

Besides these festival days the Sundays after Christmas also stand in connection with Christmas. The mere examination of the pericopes shows it. According to old order these Sundays have the following pericopes: Luke 2, 33-40, and Gal. 4, 1-7, came upon Sunday after Christmas; Jno. 1, 1-17 and Heb. 6, 13 to 7, 3, on Sunday after New Year; Luke 2, 41-52, and Rom. 12, 1-6, on first Sunday after Epiphany; on the second Sunday after Epiphany comes the marriage at Cana. If one takes the pericopes of the festivals falling between these Sundays, Christmas, Circumcision and Epiphany, along with them, it gives a history

of the childhood of the Lord, shortened by the text of the days of Mary coming later, and not chronological, from which the second Sunday after Epiphany leads over into the public life of the Lord. This arrangement the Lutheran Church has not entirely adopted, also has not corrected, but in a twofold way has complicated it yet more. First the Sacrament of Holy Baptism was too dear to her not to wish to have a day for the preaching of it. For this justified wish she chose the texts, not found in antiquity, Matt. 3, 13-17, and Tit. 3, 4-7, that from them the baptism of the Lord and our baptism might be preached upon. Only Ottheinrich placed these pericopes upon the day of John the Baptist and makes this a day for a sermon on baptism. All other KOO. take two different ways. A part of the Lutheran KOO. place these pericopes upon the Sunday after New Year, so that they have for the respective Sundays the following pericopes: Sunday after Christmas, Luke 2, 33-40, and Gal. 4, 1-7; Sunday after New Year, Matt. 3, 13-17, and Tit. 3, 4-7; first Sunday after Epiphany, Luke 2, 41-52, and Rom. 12, 1-6. Then two more chronological slips entered, and the baptism of the Lord must precede the marriage in Cana, the first miracle, which fell upon the second Sunday after Epiphany. These improprieties moved the other class of Lutheran KOO. so that they placed the pericopes for baptism upon Quinquagesima. It is known how the custom arose in the middle ages to squander the first days of the week following *Esto Mihi* and especially the day after shrove-tide in amusement and voluptuousness, in contradistinction to the later abstinence of Lent. Because these amusements of the people in many places took the form of corruptions, the Protestant Church felt obliged to interfere lest the fast abstinence fall away. In different ways the Lutheran KOO. sought to exercise an opposite churchly influence. Some arranged a day of repentance in the week with litany, etc.; others placed in this week the quarterly public catechetical examination; others, as the Mecklenburg, give to *Esto Mihi* the Epistle Isa. 5, 11-17. Yet other North German KOO., as the Lauenburg, Wolfenbuttel and especially the Pomeranian, command in the fundamental treatment of the case that during the week before *Esto Mihi* the history of the flood, on Monday and Tuesday after *Esto Mihi* the history of Sodom and Gomorrah, and on Ash Wednesday the history of Nineveh should be treated. "Hereby intelligent pastors in cities and villages can well perceive, according to place and time, what

each one should bring to his congregation in city and village, that such heathenish, carnal, offensive things, by God's grace, may be rooted out and not again be permitted."

On *Esto Mihi* itself the pericopes of the Lord's and our baptism are to be handled and through the remembrance of their Christianity be led away from their heathenish carnival. One seeks therein an historical connection in a clear form; for since *Invocavit* has as pericope the history of the temptation, the baptism of the Lord would appear to belong properly on *Quinquagesima*. But thereby it was overlooked that the Gospel texts of the Lenten Sundays till Good Friday put together the chief things in which the devil and the world temptingly meet the Lord from the history of the temptation up to His death, and are overcome by Him, that therefore the history of the temptation in relation to the following but not to the preceding Sundays has a chronologically arranged order; that the ancient Church did not start out to make a chronological order between the pericopes of all the Sundays, but that she had only in view to form great objective groups, the history of His childhood, the prophetic life, the high-priestly suffering of the Lord, and within each of these groups as much as possible to preserve a chronological succession of pericopes, but without forbidding that the pericopes of the later groups could not precede in time the pericopes of the former groups. Rather the histories of the Gospel texts for the Lenten Sundays are partly of earlier and partly of later date compared with those of the later Epiphany Sundays; as also in reality the high-priestly office was accomplished at the same time with the prophetic, unless one falsely limits the first only to the death of the Lord on the cross. Further through the change of *Esto Mihi* to a day of baptism the order of the ancient Church was destroyed, which give to this Sunday the texts Luke 18, 31-43, and 1 Cor. 13, 1-13, and made it through them a Sunday leading to Lent, the passion of the Lord and its consideration.

Thus the betterment was dearly bought, which occurred to the Christmas cycle by this arrangement, for these KOO. order for the Sunday after Christmas the texts of the day of the Innocents, Matt. 2, 13-18, and Rev. 14, 1-5; for the Sunday after New Year, Luke 2, 33-40, and Gal. 4, 1-7, and for the first Sunday after Epiphany, Luke 2, 41-52, and Rom. 12, 1-6, so that here better but not perfect chronological order was reached.

But the mentioned derangement made in the interest of

baptism hangs together with a second want of appreciation of the old Church Year, which the Lutheran Church is guilty of in this place. If we look at the pericopes which the ancient Church assigned to the Sundays from the second after Epiphany to Sexagesima, we find the second after Epiphany has Jno. 2, 1-11, and Rom. 12, 7-16; the third after Epiphany, Matt. 8, 1-13, and Rom. 12, 17-21; the fourth after Epiphany, Matt. 8, 23-27, and Rom. 13, 8-10; the fifth after Epiphany, Matt. 11, 25-30, and Col. 3, 12-17; the sixth after Epiphany, Matt. 17, 1-8, and 2 Pet. 1, 16-21; Septuagesima, Matt. 20, 1-16, and 1 Cor. 9, 24-10, 5, and Sexagesima, Luke 8, 4-15, and 2 Cor. 11, 19-12, 9. These pericopes the Lutheran Church preserved, except that the Pomeranian liturgy has another Epistle for the third after Epiphany, Rom. 13, 11-14, and that by all instead of Matt. 11, 25-30, Matt. 13, 24-30, was taken for the fifth after Epiphany, which causes no disturbance in the signification of the day, and that the Cellen KO. on the sixth after Epiphany puts those pericopes of baptism and the history of the transfiguration to the twenty-seventh Sunday after Trinity, both without sense. If we look at these pericopes as the ancient Church selected them and the Lutheran Church has mostly received them unchanged, we see they contain a change of miracles and more or less parabolic utterances of the Lord. Through signs and wonders one proves himself a prophet; from His signs and wonders the Evangelist Matthew proved Christ to be the Great Prophet that should come; and the Church in this series of Sundays from the first after Epiphany till Sexagesima brings the congregation a selection from the signs and parables of the Lord between the youth and the time of His high-priestly office, and thus brings to view the prophetic life of the Lord. This series of Sundays is a fixed circle within the festival half year. This signification the Lutheran Church directly mistook. Not only that she nowhere mentions it, but directly and expressly reckons these Sundays in the Christmas cycle and orders that the collects and hymns of Christmas should be used on these Sundays. But there is no unanimity among the different KOO. whether they shall demand the use of these hymns and thus reckon the Christmas cycle to Purification (the 2d of February), or as the Mecklenburg KO., to Septuagesima, or to *Esto Mihi*. Moreover, naturally the observation must arise that in such accepted Christmas cycle the pericopes of these Sundays do not at all fit, and therefore there appears beside the direction in the Christ-

mas liturgy the permission that on these Sundays such hymns may be sung as "better suit the Gospels of the days." Then these Sundays are no more Sundays of the festival cycle, but only in the way the Trinity Sundays are conceived. Thus the Pomeranian liturgy looks upon the first after Epiphany as fixed to preach upon the duty of parents and rulers, etc., the second after Epiphany to preach of marriage, since the passage of the Marriage in Cana is used in the marriage ceremony. Finally the KOO., not seldom deceived by the designation of these Sundays, have presumed that with Septuagesima a new series of Sundays begins, and therefore have arranged for this and the following Sundays special liturgical forms, which certainly do not and cannot have a peculiar historical relation. Thereby it is forgotten that the names Septuagesima and Sexagesima descend from a calculation of the Lenten period, which is older than the definite arrangement of the Church Year, and that in this arrangement those Sundays received such names, but with regard to their signification they belong to the Sundays of Epiphany. With Quinquagesima, to which all KOO., with the exception above named, give the old pericopes, Luke 18, 31-43, and 1 Cor. 13, 1-13, it passes over into Lent, which reaches over into the holy week. Invocavit has Matt. 4, 1-11, and 2 Cor. 6, 1-10; Meminiscere, Matt. 15, 21-28, and 1 Thess. 4, 1-7, Oculi, Luke 11, 14-28, and Eph. 5, 1-9; Lætare, Jno. 6, 1-15, and Gal. 4, 21-31; Judica, Jno. 8, 46-59, and Heb. 9, 11-15. These established pericopes the Lutheran Church retained; only those KOO., which according to the above place the pericopes of baptism on *Esto Mihi*, put the pericopes properly coming on *Esto Mihi* upon *Lætare*, because in connection with this they order that the passion history of the Lord in the Sunday sermons should first be preached on *Lætare*. In opposition to the present practice the earlier Lutheran Church generally did not preach the passion history in the chief services, but referred this to the weekly services and kept for the Sunday services those pericopes. Thereby these pericopes obtained a peculiar relation to the whole celebration of Lent, which in general is received as the great time of repentance in the Church. These pericopes contain a passion history of the Lord like as the proper passion history, but with this difference, that they portray the Lord always as overcoming the world and the devil. If one now sees that the ancient Church reckoned the Sundays in Lent as days of the Lord and, properly taken, not as days in Lent, then these pericopes with the sermons in-

interpreting them enter into the great feast-time as another source of Christian exaltation, of comfort, of establishment in the victorious power of the Lord. This fact the liturgy makes very prominent. The Lenten collects made in relation to those pericopes never omit to exalt the power of God and His Son, in praise and thanksgiving, and to pray for our comfort and salvation. The same is shown when we look at the hymns appointed by the liturgies for these Sundays, and find among them the proper victorious hymns of the Church, as "A Tower of Strength Our God is Still," etc.

In the United KOO. this fact with the giving up of the pericopes falls away, and only the fast-time remains. But the Lutheran Church did not abide with her arrangement in behalf of Lent; each Protestant KO. has an order for fasting. Indeed the pomp which the medieval Church had introduced into Lent and holy week was put away, as well as bodily fasting.

"The fasting on Palm Sunday and holy week we let remain, not that we would compel any one to fast, but that the passion and Gospels arranged for this time should remain, yet not so that one hold to the black altar cloth, breaking palm branches, covering pictures and whatever belongs to illusion, or sing four passions or preach eight hours on Good Friday on the passion."—Luther. Following these words our Church has made the passion season a time to teach doctrine. She made it a time for the catechism, since she put one of the quarterly catechetical examinations in it, and recommended to apply the afternoons of these Sundays with special industry to catechization. In a special manner Lent was observed by preaching upon the passion history. As text the synoptic arrangement of the passion history already at hand, but newly revised by Bugenhagen and yet in use, served. But a difference arose with regard to the arrangement of these passion sermons. The most KOO. order, as the Mecklenburg, that the passion history should continue from *Esto Mihi* on till Palm Sunday in the weekly services, or when in villages there are no weekday services, should be preached in the afternoons on Sundays till the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem. This and what follows it, find their place on Palm Sunday and through the holy week. Others, as the Pomeranian, have the whole passion history explained in weekday services from the week of Septuagesima on into the week before *Judica*, so that the history of the burial of Christ is finished before *Judica*.

Then, after one has preached on the Sunday *Lætare* on Luke 18, 31-43, he begins on the afternoon of the Sunday *Judica* the passion history from the beginning, and thus, as we shall see, extends through the holy week.

Holy week unites itself to Lent as an inherent part. The celebration of it from the medieval Church was overloaded with processions, dramatic performance of the burial, resurrection, etc., of the Lord, with consecrations of palms and so forth. The Catholicizing Brandenburg K.O. holds, with the removal of the palm-asses and palm-consecrations, yet many like things, as the procession on Palm Sunday, feet-washing on Maundy-Thursday, the representation of the sepulchre on Good Friday. All this found no entrance in the Lutheran Church; but she also provided for a fuller celebration of this holy week. A double thought led thereto and a fundamental difference in the execution conditioned it: either in the interest of teaching, the whole passion history should be repeated in reading and sermon; or on each day that be treated, which according to the history occurred on it, the celebration of holy week be made an image of its once real occurrence, and so the congregation, preaching and hearing it, may live through it. In the first case, on whose side the majority of K.O. stand, there was needed only the simple direction that daily one hour, or where possible, two hours before and after midday the passion history be preached, and then it would follow of itself that Maundy-Thursday, Good Friday and Saturday would have their proper passages. If so many religious hours could not be found, one was content to preach on Palm Sunday, Maundy-Thursday and Good Friday on the regular pericopes, but ordered that on Palm Sunday or on Good Friday, or on both, after the chief, midday and vesper sermons, the whole passion history in three sections be read, without explanation or with a short summary. How the matter was arranged in the second case the example of the Pomeranian liturgy may show. As remarked above, on the afternoon of Sunday *Judica*, after a sermon in the morning on the regular pericope, the passion history was begun anew, and finished on this Sunday and in the week following till the entrance into Jerusalem. On Palm Sunday a sermon was preached in the forenoon on the Lord's Supper from 1 Cor. 11, 23-29, because communion was to be held on every day of holy week; in the afternoon on the entrance into Jerusalem; on Monday and Tuesday on what happened on these days; on Wednesday on the council in the house of Caiaphas,

the feast in the house of Simon, and the betrayal by Judas; on Maundy-Thursday the paschal supper, the institution, feet-washing, admonition of Judas and Peter; on Good Friday from "when they had sung a hymn" to the end; on the burial, on Saturday. Otherwise labor during this time except on the Sundays and festival days was not stopped. In these passion services of holy week the passion history was given in formal, but simply noble oratorios—a nobler revivification of the dramatic performances in the Romish Church—as the Wittenberg hymn book of 1573, offers such an oratorio. As the above shows there is place in both cases for passion sermons; the regular pericopes should yet be given.

Palm Sunday had from of old Matt. 21, 1-9, or Mark 11, 1-10, and Phil. 2, 5-11, which, as we see, are preserved in many KOO., and are inserted in the festival of holy week. We have already remarked that often the festival of the annunciation is removed to Palm Sunday, which then receives its pericopes Luke 1, 26-38, and Isa. 7, 10-16, and even often the forenoon of Palm Sunday is fixed for a sermon on the Lord's Supper on 1 Cor. 11, 23-32, or Matt. 26, 17-28. In the latter case a sermon is delivered on Maundy-Thursday on the part of the passion history from the Paschal Supper to the passage about the two swords. Otherwise the two established pericopes of Maundy-Thursday are Jno. 13, 1-15, and 1 Cor. 11, 23-32. As Epistle also Exodus 12, 1-13, appears. Good Friday has for Gospel the whole last act of the passion history, or the whole passion history, as Matt. 27, 45-50, according to the example of antiquity, as Epistle always Isa. 53, 1-12. Moreover the simplicity is noteworthy which the old KOO. without exception oppose in the celebration of Good Friday. On this day, in which every preacher feels how little the sermon reaches up to the realities of the day, they do not wish to preach much, but only a separate sermon after the reading of the passion history, or, as the Wolfenbüttel, that the history be read and "explained by a short summary not over a half hour in length"; or they order the reading itself in a special manner, as the Lauenberger, the whole history shall be read. "And when the history of the passion has reached the place where the Lord bowed His head, the preacher shall then thus address the people: 'Now we have heard the whole history that Christ died for us and commanded His Spirit into the hands of His heavenly Father as a sacred deposit. And as He thereby teaches us that on account of His death our souls, when they depart, should be in and be commanded to His

hands, let us all call upon the Father, for Christ's sake, in our last hour to take our souls within His fatherly hands, and preserve them from all harm. To reach this we will say the Lord's Prayer in true faith and devotion." After the Lord's Prayer the history is entirely gone over and then not over a half hour of instruction concerning the cause, power and comfort of Christ's death.

On the Easter festival the first day has Mark 16, 1-8, and 1 Cor. 5, 6-8; the second, Luke 24, 13-35, and Acts 10, 34-41, while the old lectionaries have Acts 2, 14ff. as Epistle; the third, Luke 24, 36-47, and Acts 13, 26-33—also with only one exception the old pericopes. It is evident that in the conception of the Easter festival there is no difference between the ancient Church and the Lutheran.

The "holy, joyful" Easter festival continues in the Sundays till ascension. This signification the Lutheran KOO. fully recognized, for they commanded that Easter hymns be sung on these Sundays. But the further from Easter the more a second factor entered in the old pericopes of these Sundays, the looking towards ascension and Whitsunday. This factor (moment) the Lutheran KOO. rejected and decidedly favored the first. Thus the KO. of Ottheinrich recommended that on these Sundays a synoptical compilation of the history of the resurrection should be read. All ordered that in these days the resurrection of the Lord and our own should be preached. To this one-sided dogmatic advantage must be ascribed the change in some KOO. of the ancient pericopes, which we shall now discuss. They are the new received passages which treat of the resurrection. Quasimodogeniti, Jno. 20, 19-31, and 1 Jno. 5, 4-20; Misericordias, Jno. 10, 12-16, and 1 Pet. 2, 21-25, instead of the last with some 1 Cor. 15, 20-49; Cantate, Jno. 16, 5-15, and James 1, 17-21, but instead of the last according to some 1 Cor. 15, 50-58, and according to others 1 Cor. 15, 39-44; Rogate, Jno. 16, 23-30, and James 1, 22-27, instead of the last in some also 1 Cor. 15, 51-57.

The Pomeranian KO. gives to Rogate as Epistle 1 Tim. 2, 1-4 and leads us thereby to something further. She will thus introduce rogation week with Rogate. According to ancient custom the four days before Ascension were given to processions (the so-called Processions) and the singing of the Litany to implore for fields and gardens the preservation of crops and a fruitful year. At the time of the Reformation these processions had degenerated so that they no longer gave occasion for prayer,

but for all kinds of wantonness. The Reformation abolished them. In many places it was advisable to put something better in their stead. KOO. concerned in this, ordered either that after the week-day sermon on this week the Litany be sung, or that a day in this week be kept as a day of prayer, and most fully the Pomeranian thus: in all week-day services of this week the sermons must treat of prayer, and hymns of prayer and repentance and the Litany must be sung, and no organ is to be touched — the day of Ascension excepted.

Ascension has Mark 16, 14-20 and Acts 1, 1-11 undisputed from of old. Exaudi has Jno. 15, 26-16, 4 and 1 Peter 4, 8-11, also from of old, and becomes through these pericopes a Sunday for the introduction of Whitsunday. Though many Lutheran liturgies ascribe to it the service of Ascension and Ottheinrich and the Baden-Hoehbergische KO. at the same time require that on this Sunday the Ascension of the Lord should be preached upon. These accept it as an after-celebration of Ascension.

The first Whitsunday has Jno. 14, 23-31 and Acts 2, 1-13; the second Jno. 3, 16-21 and Acts 10, 42-48; the third, Jno. 10, 1-11 and Acts 2, 29-36, or Jno. 15, 1-8 and Acts 8, 14-25. These pericopes of the second and third days, which do not appear in the old lectionaries, close the half-yearly festivals which bring the cycle of the gracious deeds of God, with the allusion to the right use of these gracious deeds and to the necessity of fruitfulness, and lead over to the Trinity period.

The cycle of Trinity Sundays begins with the Trinity festival, for thus the Lutheran KOO. received it, when they instead of the baptismal formula suitable for the meaning of the Trinity festival, give it back the old pericopes, Jno. 3, 1-15 and Rom. 11, 33-36, which it of old had as the octave of Whitsunday. We must accept it only in this signification. Yet others try to combine the two meanings, as the Pomeranian, which speaks about it thus: "The holy fathers gave this gospel on this festival day, that the Christian congregation might be instructed in the two greatest articles of Christian doctrine, of the Holy Trinity and of regeneration or justification. When these two are pure, the others will also remain pure."

The pericopes of this period run as in our hymnal from first after till the tenth, instead of which Epistle those KOO. have Rom. 9, 30-33, which place the ordinary

Epistle, on account of its dogmatic contents, in the period between Easter and Ascension. The remainder run as in our hymnal, except on 17th, Luke 14, 1-11 stands instead of Mark 8, 1-9; and as a second on the 27th, Matt. 5, 1-12, and Rom. 3, 21-29. These pericopes of the Trinity Sundays are the same which the Comes has, with the exception of the last three Sundays, for which the ancient lectionaries in part have different, and in part none at all. The Lutheran Church with right has not sought a mutual relation and a historic or a dogmatic connection between these different pericopes. Therefore she does not prescribe hymns for the whole cycle or for an entire circle of Trinity Sundays, but for each separate one, and permits the choice to be made in view of the contents of the individual pericopes. Just so little does she give one collect for the whole period, but a selection of collects of different contents, or also — but first in later time of perverted taste — for each Sunday two collects fashioned from the pericopes with pedantic profundity. The Lutheran Church accepts the Trinity period, as it should be received, as the period in which to read in great abundance what was given the Church for faith and life, through the gracious deeds of God related in the festival half of the Church Year.

In the last three Trinity Sundays there appears a marked homogeneousness and in them a distinct reference to the time of the Church Year; at the end of it reference should be had to the end of things. This signification is received by the Lutheran Church; she requires that in this period the sermons should treat of death, eternity, judgment, etc.; and the regulation appears that in case the year has no 26th after Trinity its pericopes are to be used on the last Sunday of the Church Year.

Although the above representation does not attempt to relate all the departures which the different Lutheran Churches here and there, often for local reasons, permitted to be made in the old pericopes, yet this much is shown, that the Lutheran Church in general holds closely to the ancient Church Year, and has on the whole rightly perceived its sense; that she also at times has not feared to make changes in certain cases and thereby has perhaps improved it, although she has destroyed the original harmony. What the Lutheran Church sees in the Church Year and its pericopes, and how necessary their preserva-

tion for the orderly arrangement of correct churchly teaching, can be learned from the Wittenberg KO. of 1536. "Although according to the doctrine of the holy Apostle Paul no distinction in days or times should be urged upon Christians, but according to the prophecy of Isaiah Christians should celebrate Sabbath on other and all days, yet for the sake of preaching, prayer, thanksgiving, the administration of the holy sacraments and bodily rest, all of which we cannot dispense with on account of our weakness in body and soul, some days must be preferred on which each one interests himself in divine service and gives up other labor, except for bodily preservation. And lest the glorious, great, unspeakable blessings of our dear Father, through Jesus Christ our dear Savior, so wonderfully shown to us poor despised worms, and subsequently through His apostles and true servants so diligently expounded and delivered, be extinguished in time, and, where not constantly renewed through daily preaching and thanksgiving, finally vanish from our eyes and be placed in blamable forgetfulness, and all such chief parts of Christian doctrine once for all be covered up, but that more successfully one after the other might be taught to the Christian congregation with industry, we have deemed it good that one festival should follow after another, and in the festivals of Christ to hold the order which, in the natural order of deeds and the supernatural disposition and working, so graciously begot one after another from the beginning of the conception and incarnation of Christ, our dear Savior, for our redemption and eternal salvation." And whoever wishes to see in a short and classic form how the Lutheran Church views the Church Year as a whole, according to its matter, let him compare Chem. Exam. Conc. Trid. IV. 211.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

THE REJECTION OF THE JEWS AND THE UNIVERSAL GRACE OF GOD: Chapters IX-XI.

CHAPTER IX.

A. *The Rejection of the Jews is a Cause of Heartfelt Sorrow to the Apostle: Verses 1-5.*

In the preceding chapter the Apostle had given a glowing description of the universality, all-sufficiency, and surety of divine saving grace as to be found in Jesus the Christ. But it became clearer day by day that the very people to whom Christ with all His blessings had been promised in the first place, the Jews, as a people had rejected Him and in consequence also had been rejected as a people. They did not only not hold the foremost position in the New Testament economy, which according to Old Testament prophecies they might be expected to occupy, but seemed to be rejected altogether. How is this to be reconciled with the universal, all-sufficient grace of God in general and in particular with His promises given to that people in the Old Testament? That is the problem that the Apostle proposes to solve in the next three chapters.

Being the foremost champion of the perfect equality of the Gentiles and the Jews before the Gospel, the Apostle was by the self-righteous and jealous Jews regarded as the enemy of his own people, much as he loved them and as a rule first preached the Gospel to them wherever he came. Hence, before proceeding to the solution of the problem mentioned, he first gives solemn expression to the feelings of his heart with regard to this matter. As a man that is in the most intimate communion with Christ, the essential Truth, and whose conscience, enlightened and governed by the Holy Spirit Himself, adds its testimony to his own, he protests (1) that his very heart always is full of sorrow

V. 1. A most emphatic and solemn protestation. *Truth I speak in Christ: having my whole being and life in Him who was promised and has come as the Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel and the whole human race, being governed and led entirely*

and pain because of the fate of the Jewish people (2). This is the case to such an extent that, if it were in accordance with the good and gracious will of God, he would wish to be himself cursed and cut off from Christ, the source of all true happiness and bliss, for the sake of saving his brethren according to the flesh (3). And not only his relation to them as his own people prompts him to follow the example of

by Him in whose mouth guile was never found (1 Pet. 2, 22). Comp. 2 Cor. 2, 17; 12, 19; Eph. 4, 17; 1 Thess. 4, 1. *I do not lie*: the same idea emphatically repeated in the negative form (comp. 1 Tim. 2, 7; John 1, 20). *My conscience bearing witness with me in the Holy Ghost*: qualifies and emphasizes the preceding assertion, I do not lie. By making this assertion, he himself bears witness; and his conscience, being in the power and dominion of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth (John 15, 26), and therefore a most reliable witness, bears testimony with him. Of this he can, and does, assure his readers; and unless they regarded him as a liar without any conscience and shame, they could not but believe him.

V. 2. Mark the gradation: *sorrow* — *pain* ($\delta\delta\eta\eta$, grief, distress); *great* — *unceasing*; *I* ($\mu\iota$) — *my heart*. The object of his sorrow and pain he does not mention, but in tender regard to the persons concerned leaves it to be gathered from what follows — a practical lesson in Christian, and especially pastoral, wisdom and love.

V. 3. "For" ($\gamma\alpha\rho$): explains the greatness of his sorrow and pain by expressing the love on which it is based, and at the same time intimates its object, viz., the Jews being what in his boundless love he would gladly be in their stead. "I could wish" (or, pray, $\epsilon\breve{\nu}\chi\mu\alpha\iota$ denoting both, since a prayer naturally includes a wish); and this wish would be real if its realization were known to be possible. After $\eta\delta\chi\omega\mu\eta\tau$ the usual $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ is omitted because not the (unfulfilled) condition is to be emphasized, but rather the wish. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\mu\alpha$ (from $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\mu\eta\mu$, to lay upon, set up as a votive gift, dedicate) is originally anything offered or dedicated to God; in the Septuagint translation, however, it is == **מְדֹתָה**, a thing or person devoted to God for the purpose of being destroyed, doomed to destruction (over against $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\mu\alpha$ which has not this evil signification, comp. Luke 21, 5, where the latter form is the true reading). In the New Testament it signifies *curse* (Acts 28, 14) and (*a man*) *accursed*, devoted to perdition (Gal. 1, 8 sq.; 1 Cor. 16, 22; 12, 3). $\acute{\alpha}\pi\delta\tau\omega\acute{\alpha}\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega\acute{\alpha}\iota$: "away from Christ," separated from Him, belongs to $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\theta\mu\alpha$; separation from Christ necessarily makes a sinner accursed. "I myself" in contrast with "my brethren." $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\nu}\rho$: for, in behalf, for the ben-

Moses (Ex. 32, 32) in a heroic love incomprehensible to common man, but still more the glorious privileges that had been granted to them by God Himself. For they were, and hence rightly bore the honorary title of, the covenant people: they had been adopted by God as His people over against other nations (Ex. 4, 22; Hosea 11, 1); in their midst the glory of God had dwelt visibly (Ex. 24, 16; 40, 34sqq.; 1 Kings 8, 10; Heb. 9, 5); with their forefathers God repeatedly had made a covenant (Gen. 15, 18, etc.); to them in the first place the Law had been given through Moses (Ex. 20); to them the true service of God had been revealed (Heb. 9, 1); to them also in the first place the Messiah and His blessings had been promised often and in various ways (4); they could boast of the most glorious ancestors, the patriarchs; and, greatest prerogative of all, the promised Savior of the world was of their number as to His human nature, He who at

efit (salvation); instead of (here the one idea includes the other). "My kinsmen (relatives) according to the flesh" is apposition to "my brethren," added in order to distinguish these natural relatives from the brethren by faith (Phil. 1, 14; Col. 1, 2; comp. Philem. 16).

V. 4. *Οἰτοῦς*: being such persons as, showing their dignity and exalted position. "Israelites": the *theocratic* name of the Jews (comp. Gen. 32, 28), distinguishing them from the gentile nations (comp. v. 6; 11, 1; Phil. 3, 5; John 1, 47), whilst "Hebrews" refers to their (holy) *language* (comp. Acts 6, 1; — 2 Cor. 11, 22), and "Jews" (*Iουδαῖοι*, originally denoting only the members of the tribe or kingdom of Juda, but after the return from the Babylonian captivity, since the members of the northern kingdom did not return, the name of the whole people) designates them as simply a *nation* among others (comp. Matt. 2, 2; 27, 11. 29). This the distinction in general; sometimes the terms are used interchangeably. The following genitives *ῳν* refer to *Ισραηλῖται*; hence the relative clauses introduced by them are not coordinate with *οῖτοῦς*, but subordinate to it, showing wherein the prerogatives of Israelites consisted. Each one of the eight prerogatives mentioned has the definite article prefixed, to designate it as the well-known one. The first is the basis of all the others; the last, the crown and glory of all. "Adoption": comp. 8, 15. "The covenants" and "the promises" correspond, as do "the giving of the Law" and "the service" of God (chiastic position), the second being in each case the result of the first. "The promises" are put last in order to have them followed immediately by those to whom they were given in the first place, "the fathers," and Him who was their goal and center, Christ.

the same time is, and must be, Lord of all that exists, very God to be praised in all eternity (5).

B. *The Rejection of the Jews is not in Conflict with the Promises of God which never were Based on Natural Descent: Verses 6-13.*

The rejection of the Jewish people does not prove that the promises of God given to them are not being fulfilled.

V. 5. "The fathers": the patriarchs in the strictest sense (comp. Ex. 3, 13. 15; 4, 5; Acts 3, 13; 7, 32.) "Of whom," as a member of their nation. *Tὸν κατὰ σάρκα*, accusative of relation: as regards that which pertains to flesh = with respect to His human nature. This expression necessarily leads over to the following. *Who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen:* this translation, referring the words in question to Christ, is the only one in accordance with the context and original language. The great privilege and honor of having Christ for a member of the people is not shown to its full extent when His divinity is left unmentioned; moreover, the express mention of His humanity in the first clause makes us expect also the mention of His divinity (comp. 1, 3 sq.). A doxology, directed to God the Father, is entirely unexpected and out of place here where the Apostle gives utterance to his great sorrow and pain; and, according to a general and natural rule, in a doxology the word "blessed," or its equivalent, takes the *first* place in the sentence (comp. 2 Cor. 1, 3; Eph. 1, 3; — also the Septuagint translation Psalm 68, 20, where even the subject is repeated in order to have "blessed," *εὐλογητός*, not in the last, but in the first place). If δὲ did not refer to *Χριστός* but belonged to *Θεός* the participle *δέ* would be entirely superfluous and out of place. And as to the plea that Paul in no other place calls Christ God, Phil. 2, 6 and Col. 2, 9 ought to be a sufficient answer, not to mention Eph. 5, 5; 2 Thess. 1, 12; Tit. 2, 13. The question, however, is in place whether a comma is to be placed after *πάντων*, as in our translation and explanation above, or whether we should translate, "Who is God over all, blessed forever." To us the former construction seems most natural; "over all" is equivalent to Lord of all, and God is the fitting climax (comp. John 20, 28). "God over all" is, moreover, an unusual expression, though synonymous appellations occur (2 Cor. 6, 18; 1 Tim. 6, 15, etc.). The general sense remains the same, what construction we may adopt. The words, "blessed forever, Amen," are added as a solemn and enthusiastic confession over against the blasphemies of the unbelieving Jews.

promises pertain (6). Nor is the fact that a man has Abraham for his natural ancestor a proof that he is Abraham's true, spiritual child. Not natural descent but the word of grace and promise determines man's relation to God. That becomes apparent already in the very beginnings of the Old Testament people of God, when the question was, who was to be the ancestor and father of this people, the son of Abraham in *this* respect. Not natural descent, not even priority of birth, was the determining factor: not Ishmael, but Isaac, and only Isaac, was by God Himself declared to be the seed of Abraham in this theocratical sense (7). Hence the rule is, Not natural descent, but divine promise determines (8); for the word of God to which Isaac owed both. That would only be the case if natural descent gave any claim to these promises. But not all the natural descendants

V. 6. *Οὐδὲ οἵον δέ = οὐ τοῖον δὲ λέγω οἵον δέτι:* But not such a thing I say as that = but this does not mean that, etc. *Ἐκπέπτωσεν:* has fallen out, viz., of its position of validity and reliability. "The Word of God" concerning the Messiah and His blessings, promised in the first place to Israel. *Οὗτοι:* these, emphatic. *Ἐξ* here denotes natural descent.

V. 7. The subject of *εἰσιν* is to be supplied from the preceding verse, viz., *οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ*, the Israelites by nature. *Πάντες:* some are, but not all; hence natural descent does not guarantee spiritual sonship. After *ἄλλ'* nothing is to be supplied; the Apostle simply states the real condition by citing and making his own the words of Holy Writ, just as we use to do. "In Isaac shall be called seed for thee" (Gen. 21, 12): Abraham's son in the theocratic sense is to be recognized in the person of Isaac. To be called, in such a connection, is more than simply to be = to be acknowledged and recognized as truly being (comp. Luke 1, 32; — Phil. 2, 9).

V. 8. "That is": herein the idea is expressed. "Children of the flesh" are such as flesh, or man, procreates, children by natural descent. Of course, the children of God, being men, are also children of the flesh, or of man; but their merely being the children of a certain man, whoever he may be, does not make them children of God. *Ταῦτα* emphatic (comp. v. 6). The "children of God" are identical with the "children" spoken of in v. 7, viz., the spiritual children of Abraham. "The children of the promise" are those that have become children in consequence and by virtue of the divine promise bearing on them. Such was the case with Isaac (Gal. 4, 23). "Seed" to be taken in the same sense as v. 7: child of Abraham in a special sense, theocratic or spiritual. "Are reckoned" by God.

of Jacob are the true, spiritual Israel to which alone the his existence and his position as ancestor of the people of God was a word of promise (9; comp. Gen. 17, 21; 18, 10, 14). Applied to the question of salvation this rule means that only those that in faith apprehend and appropriate the word of divine promise will be saved, are children of God in this, spiritual, sense. Only because the Jewish people did not accept the promised Messiah in faith were they rejected notwithstanding their natural descent from Abraham. But if a person should raise the objection that Isaac, and not Ishmael, was chosen the ancestor of the people of the covenant because he was the son of Abraham's legitimate wife, whilst Ishmael was the son of a bond-woman, so that after all natural descent had something to do with the choice made: the case of Rebecca and her two sons shows conclusively that such an assumption would be a mistake; for Jacob and Esau had the same father and the same mother, and yet Jacob, and he alone, was chosen to be the ancestor of the people of God, though Esau was the older son (10). And this was done before either could have merited the choice, in order to have also here as the determining factor the elective purpose of God, that is, a divine purpose that in-

V. 9. After *ἐπαγγελίας* the word *λόγιος* can be supplied: "for a word of promise is this word"; though it is not necessary, as the rendering can be: this word is (one) of promise, belongs, pertains, to promise, contains promise. "At this time," this definite time or season, viz., of the following year. The literal meaning of the Hebrew equivalent is most probably, "as the time revives" = when the time of the year that is now dying, becoming a thing of the past, returns. "I shall come" (the Hebrew is, I shall certainly return), if not in visible appearance, at least in the realization of the promise; for the same God that gave the promise also fulfilled it (comp. Gen. 21, 1 sq.).

V. 10. "But not only": it is very difficult, if not impossible, to complete this sentence in such a way that the predicate will also fit to "Rebecca" in the next clause. In his vivid flow of thought Paul merely gives utterance to the main ideas, expecting his attentive and intelligent readers to supply what is lacking to a complete sentence from the context. But the supplement can be given in a general way only, e. g.: "But not only" is this truth to be seen in the history of Abraham and Isaac, "but also Rebecca" in her experience as the mother of Esau and Jacob is a witness to the same truth. "Our father": Paul here has to do with Jews.

volves and includes an election, a choice, not depending on any works or merits of man but simply on God who calls men to a certain position in His Church; although God, the Eternal Wisdom, of course never acts arbitrarily, but always follows principles and rules laid down by Himself (11). Thus the *theocratic position* of Jacob and Esau and their descendants, *not their salvation*, was determined by God merely according to His divine wisdom and will, so that the older became inferior to the younger (12; comp. Gen. 25, 23); and in this sense God loved Jacob and hated Esau (13; comp.

V. 11. *Μήπω*: the subjective negation, to ward off a false opinion likely to be held by persons not acquainted with the circumstances = do not think that they were already born, etc. The subject of *γεννηθέντων* and *πραξάντων* is to be supplied, viz., *αὐτῶν*, the two sons of Rebecca, known from the context. The emphatic: anything; *ἀγαθόν* (good = useful, conducive to the honor of God) *ἢ φαῦλον* (bad = of little or no value) may almost be viewed as an apposition. *Ινα* *χτλ.*: the final clause emphatically placed before the principal clause (v. 12). "The elective purpose" is one that does not extend over all men but over those only that have been elected or chosen. An election or choice, however, even with intelligent, sensible men is not a haphazard action, but dependent on some norm or rule laid down by the one that elects or chooses; much more so with God, the Essential Wisdom. This "elective purpose" of God is, of course, in the work of salvation owing to foreseen wilful resistance to His grace on the part of many men (comp. 8, 28 sq.); but also in the appointment to a theocratic position it is based on the foreseen difference between men (11, 2). "Might stand," by not basing the purpose on any foreseen merits on which a claim could be established; "not of works" (having works for the source and cause, &c), "but of Him that calleth," explains the preceding final clause, showing whereon that standing of the elective purpose is dependent. The objective negation *οὐδέ* is used after *ινα* because the one idea *εἰς ἔργων* is to be denied emphatically.

V. 12. *Οτι* introduces direct speech, hence is not translated. "The greater" is here the older, and "the smaller" the younger; and the ancestors include their descendants. "Serve": be subject (comp. Gen. 27, 29, 40; 2 Sam. 8, 14; 2 Kings 14, 7, 22). The theocratic position, of course, makes the way of salvation easier; and reversely.

V. 13. Mal. 1, 2 sq. shows that regard is not had to eternal salvation, but to historical position and lot. "Love" and "hate" is here used anthropopathically; "not so much the affect as the effect is meant." With men such a treatment would as a rule be

Mal. 1, 2sq.). And all this proves the correctness of the rule mentioned above, Not natural descent but the word of grace and promise determines a man's relation to God, his position in the kingdom of God.

C. *In General, the Grace of God Acknowledges no Human Claim whatever: Verses 14-21.*

To draw from what has been said the inference that injustice is a ruling principle with God, would be blasphemous, prone as human reason is to draw it (14). Even to Moses, His most prominent and faithful servant in the Old Testament, God declares that His mercy and compassion is altogether and exclusively dependent on His own free will, so that no man can lay down binding rules or advance any claims with regard to it (15; comp. Ex. 33, 19). Hence it has its origin and cause not in man's will or exertions, but

the effect of arbitrary love and hatred; hence it is here ascribed to these affects.

V. 14. "What then shall we say?" = what conclusion are we to draw from what has been set forth? (comp. 3, 9; 7, 7). *Μη* indicates a negative answer. *Τῷ θεῷ*: of the true God (article). this certainly cannot be said; it would be a contradiction in terms, and hence a blasphemy. Therefore the emphatic *μή γένοτο*: may it not happen! let it not be! by no means! (comp. 3, 4; 6, 2; 1 Cor. 6, 15; Gal. 2, 17; 3, 21; compare also the Septuagint translation of **חָלֵלָה** Gen 44, 17; Jos. 22, 29). "God forbid!" is a free translation, but exactly expresses the meaning. The injustice is supposed to manifest itself in an election without regard to any human claims.

V. 15. What God in this respect says to the well-known, prominent Moses (article and emphatic position) certainly applies to every man; if Moses had no claims on divine grace, no one has. *Ἐλεεῖν* is more active, as manifested in deed; *οἰχτείρειν* (*οἰχτειρίσω* a later form of the future tense, as if from *οἰχτείρεω*) more the pity and compassion dwelling in the heart: to show mercy — to have compassion. The latter may be the stronger expression, since the external act may be without any emotion of the heart. The Hebrew equivalents (**חָנוּ** and **רָחַם**) can be distinguished in the same way. *Οὐδὲν*: (on) whomsoever; God alone determines who is to be an object of His mercy and compassion, though, of course, not arbitrarily. Also the repetition of the verbs gives expression to the absolutely free, supreme self-determination of God, as far as any human claims are concerned.

simply in God Himself (16). This is also proved by the history of a contemporary of Moses that was the very reverse of the latter both in person and in fate. God in His Word tells us that He caused Pharaoh to live and to be king of Egypt just at that time for the very purpose of manifesting in him His divine power and having the glorious manifestation of this power published in all the world. Pharaoh would have been a wicked person wherever, whenever, and in whatever position he might have lived: God did not make him wicked, nor want him to be wicked; but being wicked, his place in history, which determined the peculiar form in which his wickedness developed and manifested itself, was again determined by God who makes also the wickedness of men serve His glory and purpose (17; comp. Ex. 9, 16).

V. 16. The genitives *τοῦ θέλωντος* and *τοῦ τρέχοντος* have for their subject the infinitives that must be supplied from the preceding verse, *τὸ ἐλεῖν* and *τὸ οἴχετείν*; this is not a matter pertaining to him that wills and runs, cannot be determined and claimed by him. God alone who shows His mercy can determine to whom it is to be shown, lay down rules in this regard. *Θέλειν* denotes an energetic will; *τρέχειν* refers to running in competitive races (comp. 1 Cor. 9, 24), hence indicates great exertion. *Ἐλεῖν* (*ἐλεῶντος*, for *ἐλεύντος*, is a form presupposing a present *ἐλεάω*, used by the Septuagint and ecclesiastical writers) here includes the *οἴχετείν*. The exhortations to "run" (1 Cor. 9, 24), to "work out" our salvation (Phil. 2, 12), to "strive to enter in by the narrow door" (Luke 13, 24), referring to the *way* and *order* of obtaining and retaining grace laid down by God Himself, do not contradict our present passage which speaks of the *origin* and *cause* of grace. Nobody and nothing outside of God moved and determined Him to resolve on a way and order of salvation for fallen man; but everyone that wants to be saved must permit himself to be led on that way and in that order. The former does not exclude the latter, but rather includes it. *Τοῦ ελεῶντος θεοῦ* belongs together: "the mercy-showing God."

V. 17. "For": as the divine truth stated in v. 16 is a necessary deduction from what in v. 15 is said concerning Moses, hence is proved by this, so also v. 17 brings a proof for this truth, but from the opposite side. "The Scripture," wherein the sentence is recorded, is mentioned instead of God, who is the real author, because the Apostle wants to show how the Word that God has given us as the normative revelation of His will represents the matter (comp. Gal. 3, 8. 22). The article before Pharaoh refers to him as also well known. "*Οὐτε* again introduces direct speech (comp. v. 12). *Ἐξήγειρα*: the Hebrew original, being the *Hifil*

This shows that both the mercy of God and its opposite, the hardening of obstinately-wicked men, is entirely dependent on the free, though by no means arbitrary, will of God who assigns to every man his historical position and surroundings which cannot but have the greatest influence on his religious and moral development. No man has any claims on God in that regard, thankful as every one ought to be whose divinely-ordered surroundings are such as to preclude many a danger and temptation to which another one, less favored in this respect, is exposed. But let us remember that no surroundings into which *God* has placed us are of such a nature that we *must* become and stay wicked. That was not the case with Pharaoh who had ample opportunity of turning to the true God in faith and obedience, and who was only hardened by God (Ex. 4, 21; 7, 3; 10, 20; 11, 10; 14, 4, 17) when he hardened himself (Ex. 8, 15, 32); and it is not the case with any one else: whenever God withdraws His grace from a person, leaves him to the evil imaginations and desires of his own heart, and orders circumstances and events so as to favor and facilitate his downward career, that person has offered an obstinate resistance to the grace of God that was intent also upon his salvation (18). Were a person now to say, If everything is dependent

of **רָם**, to stand, appear, come forward, stand up (as a ruler, Dan. 8, 23; 11, 2. 3. 20), means to make to stand or stand up, to appoint to an office (1 Kings 12, 32); then also, to keep standing or in existence (1 Kings 15, 4; 2 Chron. 9, 8; Prov. 29, 4). The Septuagint translation takes the word in the latter sense, besides without any reason changing the active voice to the passive (*διετηρήθης*); and the context Ex. 9, 15, 16 shows that this signification is the one intended there. But this latter meaning presupposes and includes the former, which is the only one that can be expressed by *ἀξεγείρω*; and Paul, moved by the Holy Spirit, made use of it in order to represent the whole history and life of Pharaoh as a pertinent example and proof of the truth that is to be inculcated. To "raise up" hence here means to cause to appear and occupy a certain historical position. "In thee": in overcoming thy resistance and power, by thy destruction. "My name": my self-manifestation as that God whom not even Pharaoh could resist. "In all the earth": still taking place wherever the Bible is taken and the Gospel is spread.

V. 18. "So then": a conclusion drawn not simply from v. 17, but from verses 15-17, from the example both of Moses and Pharaoh. It is, however, noteworthy that the Apostle does *not* here state concerning the hardening of a man what in v. 16 he

on the will of God, He certainly has not also the right to

had emphasized with regard to the mercy and compassion of God, namely, that the will and the actions of man are in no sense the cause of it. "To harden" = to make hard, unable to be impressed in a salutary manner by the grace and revelation of God. That the awful fate of such a hardening is always the punishment for continued wilful and malicious resistance to divine grace and revelation, we cannot only, nay, we must, conclude from those clear, unequivocal declarations in Holy Writ that state that God really and truly wants every man to know and receive the truth as revealed by Him and thus be saved (e. g., 1 Tim. 2, 4; Rom. 11, 32; Ez. 33, 11). These passages are so strong and emphatic in their universality that they admit of no exception whatever, if the Bible is to be regarded and revered as the infallible and absolutely-reliable Word of God, whilst the statements in our present chapter that, to the superficial view and at first glance, may seem to compel us to look at those proclamations of universal grace in a different light, *can*, and therefore *must*, be understood in a sense that is not in real conflict with them. And a real conflict, a real contradiction we call that which is such even to the enlightened reason of an intelligent Christian. A man of sound mind cannot but think; that is what God enabled him to do by making him a man, and what He wants him to do. Whenever two propositions are laid before him that are really contradictory, i. e., of which the one, in the same respect, denies that which the other affirms, he cannot believe both; as long as he is a thinking man, that is, a man having and using his God-given and God-like faculties, he must reject the one *or* the other, if not both. In case he has to make a choice, he will choose that which best accords with what he knows from other sources as true and reliable. Hence an intelligent Christian cannot believe, on the one hand, that God in truth and reality wants all men to enjoy His grace and be saved, and, on the other hand, that He in eternity formed, and in time executes, a resolution that, without regard to the differing attitude and conduct of men toward the grace offered them, denies to some of them any grace that, in their natural state and condition since the fall, really is necessary if they are to be saved. If he is told and convinced that both propositions are divine truth, it is impossible for him as an intellectual being, to make both the governing principle of his faith and hope; that would be serving two masters in the strictest sense of the terms (Matt. 6, 24). The more sober and humble a Christian he is and the better he knows himself and his weak, sinful heart, the more he will be inclined to class himself with those who are excluded from the grace necessary unto salvation; and in

blame a man for being what he cannot help being (19), the answer would have to be, that man over against God can have no claim or right whatever; to assert it would be sheerest impertinence on his part, similar to that of a vessel that would venture to upbraid its maker for what he has made it (20). At least the same right that a potter has over against

temptation and affliction he cannot but decide in that direction, and thus give way to despair. Therefore not only the thorough-going, but also the half-hearted, inconsistent Calvinistic interpretation of our chapter is to be rejected; for the former boldly and frankly denies the truth of those glorious proclamations of a universal grace, existing and intended for every sinful man without any exception; and the latter, whilst claiming to present to the Christian two divine truths, of which the one is the very opposite of the other, and both of which, it is said, are to be embraced in humble faith, compels a man that acts in accordance with what God made him, and knows himself, to despair of saving grace as applying to him.

V. 19. "Thou wilt say then unto me" = wilt draw from what has been said the following conclusion (comp. 11, 19). In this way Paul meets an objection that could be expected on the part of some of his readers. "Who withstandeth His will?", viz., effectually, without having finally to yield. The answer to this rhetorical question is self-evident, namely, No one. If God shows mercy to whom He will and hardens whom He will, if everything is dependent solely on His will, a will that is supreme and irresistible, how can a man help being just what he is, good or bad, and how can God punish a man that is bad? Thus human reason, not enlightened by the Gospel, questions and argues. "Still" (*ετι*): in addition to his free, irresistible will.

V. 20. The Apostle does not refute the argumentation supposed, but repels it as entirely out of place. "O man": emphatic contrast to "God" (*τῷ θεῷ*: the true God). *Μενοῦνγε* (= μὲν οὖν γε): yes, indeed (ironically); or, nay but, yea rather (comp. 10, 18; Luke 11, 28; Phil. 3, 8). "It does not contradict, but shows the absurdity of what precedes." "Thou": emphatic, pointing back to "man" in his insignificance and weakness in comparison with God. To reply against God, to try to show that what He says or does is not right, no earth-born man should dare. *Μή* indicates that the answer expected to be given is negative. *Ἐπεῖ*: shall say (future) = can it be expected to take place and be regarded as proper? Comp. Isa. 29, 16; 45, 9; 64, 8. "Thus" (*οὕτως*), being an adverb, must qualify the verb ("didst make"), and not the object ("me"); but the manner and mode of making manifests itself in the condition of the thing made.

the clay that he works and the vessels that he forms out of it, God has over against all His creatures, man included (21).

D. *Notwithstanding all the Long-Suffering of God, His Grace can be Enjoyed only by Believers, whether from the Jews or from the Gentiles: Verses 22-33.*

When it comes to the question of right the answer can be but one, namely, that God has and vindicates to Himself absolute right and power to order the destinies of His creatures just as He pleases. But another question is, whether He makes use of this His absolute right and power over against men also with regard to their eternal fate, their salvation and condemnation. The answer as given by God Himself in His Word, is, No. God forces no man either to salvation or damnation. Every objection similar to the one mentioned above (19sq.) must be withdrawn when we consider how God in this respect acts with regard to men. He is, of course, determined eventually to manifest His full wrath and to make known His all-conquering power with respect to those men that by their obstinate resistance to His saving grace have become objects for the outpouring of divine wrath, completely fitted for eternal destruction;

V. 21. "Or": if you are not prepared to concede this, consider the following (comp. 2, 4; 3, 29; 7, 1; Matt. 20, 15). *Οὐ*, in contradistinction to *μή* (v. 20), indicates an affirmative answer. *Οὐ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ* are placed together, instead of having *ἐξουσίαν* before the genitive dependent on it, in order to emphasize the relation between the two, of which relation the right (authority, power: *ἐξουσία*) of the potter to make of the clay what he pleases is the necessary result. *Φύραμα*: properly, the result of mixing, as a rule dough; then any mixture; here the *mass* of clay mixed with water ready for the potter. *Οὐ μέν . . . δὲ* (=τὸ μέν . . . τὸ δὲ): the one (part or portion) . . . the other. This is the direct object of *ποιῆσαι*; *σκεῦος* is the second accusative (predicative): "to make the one (part or portion) a vessel for honor, the other (part or portion a vessel) for dishonor." *Ἐλέτιμήν* has an emphatic position: for a use that brings honor, e. g., at festivals; *εἰς ἀτιμίαν* denotes, of course, the opposite (comp. 2 Tim. 2, 20). The next verse must be taken in connection with the present one if we want to understand its bearing on the salvation of men. Paul in the present verse simply intends to remand arrogant human reason to its proper position in respect to what man as a creature can *demand* of God, claim as his just dues, viz., nothing whatever.

for He could not be the holy and righteous God if He would not at last give to obstinate sinners their full due. But with what longsuffering and patience does He bear them. How many opportunities does He offer them to repent and be saved (22)! This He does for their own sake because in

V. 22. *Εἰ δέ*: but if, introduces the protasis; the apodosis is omitted because in vv. 23 sqq. relative and other clauses were added that prevented concluding the sentence in conformity with its beginning. The apodosis would read about this way: wilt thou then still raise the objections mentioned? The rendering: "But what if" (in German: *Wie aber, wenn*) exactly expresses the elliptical form of the Greek. *Θέλων* (comp. 7, 18): although determined. *Ὥργην*: comp. 1, 18; 2, 8. *Ἐνδείξασθαι*: comp. v. 17. *Τὸ δύνατον*: what He can do over against the arrogance and defiant disobedience of men, even the most powerful (comp. *δύναμιν* v. 17 and *ἀδύνατον* 8, 3). *Ηνεγκεν*: endured, literally, bore. Paul speaks from the experience of the past or from the standpoint of the last judgment. *Σκεύη* here and in the next verse without the article in order to emphasize the quality. This absence of the article also shows, what is already apparent from the context, that "vessels of wrath" and "vessels of mercy" are not identical respectively with the vessels destined for honor and for dishonor in v. 21. The latter are mentioned in a connection where Paul in figurative language shows what God *could do*, as far as human claims are concerned; the former, where he sets forth what God on the contrary (*δέ*) *actually does*. "Vessels," however, men are called here in allusion to v. 21 to remind them of their relation to God as His creatures. "Vessels of wrath" (*σκεύη ὀργῆς*) are vessels that have incurred wrath, have become objects of wrath, viz., by their own fault. They are not identical with vessels *for* wrath, or for dishonor, i. e., vessels that have been made for wrath, (*σκεύη εἰς ὀργὴν* that would be, as it is *σ. εἰς ἀτιμίαν*, v. 21). *Κατηρτισμένα*: (completely) fitted, namely, by themselves, or, by Satan; at least not by God. If according to the intention of Paul *ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ* were to be supplied with *κατηρτισμένα* he could not have expressed himself in a more misleading manner, since in the next verse he expressly mentions God as the one that made ready beforehand vessels of mercy; for a person cannot help thinking that such a change in expression must be significant, denoting a difference in the idea expressed. Moreover, if God had brought them into the state of fitness for destruction (*κατηρτισμένα* is the perfect tense of the passive voice which denotes the having been brought into the condition expressed by the verb and still being in that condition), it could not be said with any truth or propriety that He bore them in much long-

Christ He loves also them; but He does it also for the sake of those who by His grace have become objects for the outpouring of His mercy and for whose salvation and glory He has already prepared everything: the longer He bears the wicked world the more time and opportunity He has for increasing the number of His children and making known the wealth of His glory destined for them (23). To the number of these objects of divine mercy Paul and the Christians at Rome belonged; and as such God had also called them (comp. 8, 30), coming, as they did, not only from the Jews but also from the Gentiles. For whenever He calls a man

suffering. Some take *χαρητισμένα* in the signification of an adjective: fit, ready (comp. Luke 6, 40; 1 Cor. 1, 10; — 2 Tim. 3, 17). The "destruction" in this connection can only mean eternal perdition.

V. 23. "And in order that" (*καὶ ἵνα*) is dependent on "He bore" (*γένεγκεν*), adding a second object God had in view by bearing with the vessels of wrath besides the one indicated by the expression "in much longsuffering," namely, making conversion possible for them. "Riches": comp. 2, 4. "Glory": comp. 5, 2; 8, 21. 80. The children of God will partake of their heavenly Father's glory; and that will be their glory. *Ἐπί*: this glory will extend over them. "Vessels of mercy" are men that are the objects of mercy, enjoy mercy (comp. v. 22). *Προητοίμασεν*: made ready beforehand, by doing everything necessary for leading them to glory, establishing already in eternity the way and order of salvation and embracing them as His own with an effective love (comp. 8, 28-30). It is not stated here that God made them vessels of mercy by what *προητοίμασεν* denotes, but that He prepared those that were vessels of mercy for glory. But it is, of course, presupposed that they have become vessels of mercy as a result of this mercy; it would not be mercy if it were in any way deserved. The *προ-*, in conformity with the *προ-* in 8, 29, is best understood of eternity. Luthardt understands *προητοίμασεν* of "the historical destination on the part of God, which is realized in their existence, but based on their being *οχεύη ἐλέους* (in the eyes of God), without answering the question how they became such." Philippi takes *προητοίμασεν* as essentially = *προῳτισεν* 8, 29, calling attention to the similar relation of *ἐχάλεσεν* to these two verbs (8, 30; 9, 24). Weiss finds in the expression "all whereby antecedent grace among Jews and gentiles prepared men for the appearance of Christ or the reception of the Gospel and thus made them vessels to whom God can show His glory"! — Here ends the interrogative sentence begun in v. 22.

to be an object of His mercy He exercises His full grace according to which a Jew is not called because he is a Jew, nor a heathen excluded because he is a heathen (24). That God can and will make also those His people that hitherto have not been such, hence also the heathen, can already be proved from the Old Testament, even from Hosea 2, 23, and 1, 10, though these passages in the first place speak of the people of Israel, represented by the son and daughter of the prophet (1, 6-9), who by their idolatry had become like unto heathen (25sq.). Whilst what is said in Hosea shows that the heathen are not to be excluded from grace and salvation because of their descent, the impressive declaration of Isaiah proves that not the people of Israel as a whole, but only a remnant will be saved (27), since God will fully and

V. 24. "As which" (viz., vessels of mercy, *οὗτοις* instead of *ἀ* attracted by *ἡμᾶς*) "He also called us": the call naturally follows the foregoing preparation (*καί* according to its position belongs to *ἐκάλεσεν*, not to *ἡμᾶς*). "Not from the Jews only": as the Jews thought it proper and right, forgetting that the calling and saving is a work of mercy and grace and therefore cannot be claimed by any man or nation as being exclusively, or principally, its prerogative.

V. 25. *Ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*: in the (book of) Hosea (comp. Mark 1, 2; John 6, 45; — Acts 7, 42). The passage is cited freely, neither the Hebrew original nor the Septuagint translation being closely followed; the citation is at the same time an inspired explanation and application. The article before Hosea marks him as the well-known prophet.

V. 26. "In the place where": wherever that may be. "Shall be called": comp. v. 7. "The living God": in opposition to the imaginary, non-existent gods whom they formerly worshipped.

V. 27. The adversative conjunction *δέ* and especially the following expression, "concerning Israel" (*ὑπέρ* here, as often, = *περὶ*), which otherwise, since Israel is mentioned by name in the citation itself, would be entirely superfluous and misleading, show that this citation refers to a class of people different from that spoken of in the preceding verse, so that the latter cannot be the Jews, but must be the heathen. "Cries": loudly proclaims, as something important and noteworthy. "The remnant," and nobody else — a case where in Greek the equivalent of our "only," or "alone" (*μόνον* or a form of the adjective *μόνος* corresponding with the noun) is omitted, the noun being emphasized instead (comp. 3, 28). "Shall be saved": the translation of the Septuagint which Paul here retained instead of the literal translation of the

in a short time execute the just punishment threatened to the obstinately unbelieving Jews, namely, their rejection as His people (28; comp. Isa. 10, 22sq.). And thus it will be, as the same prophet predicts, that if God in His grace and mercy had not left a remnant, the people of Israel would have perished as Sodom and Gomorrah (29; comp. Isa. 1, 9).

From what has been said we must conclude that whilst men that were heathen and as such did not strive for righteousness have obtained it, receiving in faith Christ as their Savior and thus coming into possession of His perfect righteousness (30), Israel, that strove for a law, or norm and rule,

Hebrew: "will return" because it is included in this and is especially fitting here.

V. 28. The literal translation of the correct reading is: "for a word, completely fulfilling and cutting short, the Lord will do (execute) upon the earth." Paul uses the incorrect translation of the Septuagint and, led by the Holy Spirit, changes it so as to be a reproduction of the general sense of the original and at the same time an explanation and application to the Jewish people of his time, who, sinning against God in a similar way as their fathers, were also to be punished in a similar way: only a remnant is saved. The "word" is one of judgment.

V. 29. "Has said before," viz., before the present time where the final fulfilment takes place = prophesied. "Lord Sabaoth": the true God, the God of the covenant and man's salvation (Lord: **יהוָה**), who is at the same time the God of the heavenly hosts (the angels and stars: **עֶנְǎוֹת**) and uses this His boundless power for the benefit of His children. "Seed" = "remnant," with the idea of growth and expansion. **Ως Γύμωρα:** instead of the dative, **ὡς** in a pleonastic and emphatic way expressing the same idea as **ώμοιώθημεν**.

V. 30. "What then shall we say?" (comp. v. 14). **Ἐθνη:** without article to emphasize quality; but then **τὰ** because pointing back: "heathen" = men not belonging to the people of the Old Testament covenant, "they that did not, etc." (comp. 2, 14). **Μή:** as one would suppose (comp. v. 11). **Διώκοντα:** pursue, follow after, strive or contend for; not righteousness, but things of this world, power, wealth, renown, etc., was what the heathen exerted themselves to attain. **Κατέλαβεν:** seized, took, laid hold of, obtained — very appropriate after **διώκοντα;** The expressions are figurative, referring to the race-course (comp. 1 Cor. 9, 24; Phil. 3, 12-14; — 1 Tim. 6, 11). **Δέ:** but (I mean) = namely (comp. 3, 22; Phil. 2, 8). **Δικαιοσύνη:** righteousness in general (without the article); then **τὴν**, making it definite (comp. **ἔθνη τὰ**). **Ἐπίστεως:** flowing out of faith, having its source in it, because

whose observance would bring them righteousness, did not attain to such a law and therefore not to righteousness (31), because they did not seek righteousness according to the will and ordination of God, viz.: by faith, but sought it as if it could be obtained by works; and hence they took offence at Christ and, instead of accepting Him for their justification and salvation, rejected Him unto their own rejection and damnation (comp. Luke 2, 34); for only by resting his faith and confidence on Him can a man without any fear of disappointment hope for eternal life and happiness (32sq.; comp Isa. 8, 14; 28, 16).

faith has apprehended and appropriated the righteousness of Christ which is imputed to the believer (comp. 1, 17; 3, 26. 30; 5, 1).

V. 31. "A law of righteousness": a law, rule, or norm (comp. 3, 27; 7, 23; 8, 2) that stands in connection with righteousness, showing how it can be obtained, viz., by following this norm. *Ἐις νόμον οὐκ ἐφθάσειν*: did not get into (unto) a norm of that nature, did not attain it.

V. 32. "Because not out of faith, but as if out of works," viz., they followed after a law of righteousness. Not the divinely-appointed basis of faith, but the supposed, imaginary basis of works was their starting point in seeking for a norm of righteousness; hence they could not but miserably fail. The true norm of righteousness is the Gospel of Christ. "The stone of stumbling," lying in their way when running after righteousness, was Christ.

V. 33. A free citation adapted to the Apostle's purpose. Christ is the Lord (Isa. 8, 14) and at the same time the goal and crown of the Old Testament theocracy, the head of the kingdom of God (Isa. 28, 16). "Shall not be put to shame": this would be the case if his faith and confidence would be disappointed (comp. 5, 5).

HOW TO ESTABLISH A PAROCHIAL SCHOOL IN A FIELD WHERE THERE HAS BEEN NONE.*

BY REV. J. H. SCHNEIDER, A. M., COLUMBUS, O.

This, my dear young friends, is the subject assigned me for an address before you. I am always glad and ready to do anything which may in the least contribute to the planting of Lutheran congregational schools. Hence I have accepted the invitation and have prepared as best I could in the time allowed me.

There is, moreover, no lack of room for starting such schools in our Synod. While we number 608 congregations and 449 pastors, we have only 265 parochial schools with 102 regularly called teachers and 165 pastors, who act in the capacity of teachers, in addition to their ministerial duties. This does not, however, mean that all but 341 congregations have parochial schools. The fact is that some congregations have two, three and even as high as six teachers, and thus also that many classes or "schools," as our statisticians are pleased to call them.

I may safely predict that very few of you will be called into fields in which parochial schools are in operation. May I not, however, presume that all of you would be only too glad if such were the case? But how to proceed to establish such schools where you do not find them, that is the question.

In my suggestions, I would direct your attention to three points:

- I. YOU MUST LOOK TO YOURSELVES.
- II. YOU MUST LOOK TO YOUR PEOPLE.
- III. YOU MUST LOOK TO YOUR GOD.

First of all you must see to it that you yourselves stand right on the parochial school question. When do you stand right? This is not yet the case when you entertain the fond wish that you might have a parochial school! You may wish and wish and wish this over again and again, until you have grown old, but you will not

* An address delivered before the students of the Theological Seminary of Capital University, and published by request.

see a parochial school. Such things do not grow and thrive on mere wishes. You do not stand right on this question until it has become a matter of conscience with you. In the depth of your hearts you must be convinced of the necessity of such schools. If you stand right, you can not think of your work and of the judgment and be at ease as long as you have not done all in your power to start a parochial school. You can not look on the children entrusted to your care and feel satisfied, as long as you do not know that they are daily receiving abundant measures of the Bread and Water of life, either at your own hand or at the hands of a competent teacher. When such is the case, and not until such is the case, do you stand right on the question of parochial schools. But until such is the case, there is no use of looking any further or of giving any other advice.

How can you gain the proper conviction? Seek to realize what is meant by the Lord's injunction: "Feed my lambs." Ask yourselves: "Whose are the children of the flock over which I am placed?" Jesus says that they are His. He has shed no meaner blood for them than for an adult. He has prepared mansions for them as well as for any saint or sage. When unthinking disciples would have driven loving mothers and cooing infants away from Jesus, He said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." The Lord has entrusted these lambs to the parents. The fathers are not to provoke their children to wrath, but are to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. For reasons apparent enough to every thinking Christian, the Lord has also made it a duty of the pastor to care for the lambs of his flock. Ask yourselves, "What shall be done for these lambs?" The Lord asks that they be fed. What, now, constitutes proper feeding? It certainly requires more than occasionally gathering them together and entertaining them. Proper feeding must result in developing and strengthening the faith which through holy baptism has been planted into the heart of the child. That child must be enabled to give a reason for the hope which is in its heart. Moreover, that child must be so equipped that it can ward off the attacks of the devil, the world and its own flesh. It must also be shown where it can find new strength and proper weapons, food for its soul and comfort for its heart. It must know what to do when it has

fallen. All this belongs to the proper feeding of Christ's lambs.

That this requires more than a mere working up of the senses, is certainly evident. Nothing else will gain the end save a thorough rooting and grounding in the Word of God. The children should know Luther's Catechism. They should be familiar with Bible histories. They should be able to name and find the books of the Bible and to give a brief outline of their contents. They should commit to memory the proof-passages found in our Catechism, some of the Psalms and other portions of Scripture, as well as some of our standard hymns. They should be taught how to read their Bibles and how to listen to a sermon. They should have an outline of the history of the Church, especially during the times of the Reformation.

I know that this is more than some of us received, but I insist that it is no more than belongs to the proper feeding of the lambs of Jesus. Having realized what the Master asks of you as His servants, examine carefully every plan or method suggested or employed to meet the Lord's injunction.

You will find that some claim that this whole work must be left to the parents. It is true, parents, and especially the fathers, are charged with the bringing up of their children. It is also true that no arrangement whatever can relieve them of this duty. This does not, however, say that in person they can or must do all that is needed. Look for a moment at the facts as they present themselves. Here is a father whose occupation takes him away from home day after day. He may not see his children awake, excepting on Sunday, and possibly not even then. Can that man give all the instructions needed? He can, and he must, if he be a father indeed, see that his child learns those things, but he can not do the explaining and drilling which are necessary.

Take another father. He might teach his children, if it depended on the time, but he has not the gift of imparting knowledge to others. He can hear what his children have learned, he can and he must insist upon it that the children do learn, but he is not qualified to impart what he himself knows and what he must desire his children to know.

Take a third father. He may know his duty, he may have time to teach and the ability to do so, but does he

do it as he should? Do his children need no aid? The Lord knew why He said to Peter: "Feed my lambs." He does not in the least infringe upon the rights of parents, nor does He give them room for the exercise of indifference, but He does mean to give them aid in carrying out their own sacred duty.

Others claim that catechetical instructions are sufficient. By this they mean that the children be gathered by the pastor more or less regularly, and that he impart the necessary religious instructions. The time usually devoted to this is Saturday or some hour during the week. What is the result? The children may get the meagerest necessities for spiritual life. The Word of God is, however, certainly not dwelling abundantly among them, as the Lord desires it. Look again at the facts as they are. If Saturday is taken, the child, as a rule, forgets from one week to the other what is heard. If a few hours are taken during the week, be it before, during or after school hours, the children come with a divided attention. Part of their mind is at school and part is at Catechetical instruction. The result is anything but satisfactory. Besides, this mode of action leads the child to look upon religious instruction as being of very secondary importance, a thing which is worth less than drawing and painting, gymnastics and play, since these have all a convenient hour assigned them, while religion is hurried in, wedged in or hung on behind. Experience amidst strenuous efforts has sufficiently proven to me that such a plan is a mere makeshift, and that its results are in accordance.

Some cover a multitude of sins with the Sunday school. I am not opposed to Sunday schools. I see that we need them, if only as a safeguard against the zealous proselyters around us. I do not, however, for a moment admit that Sunday schools can furnish what our children need. Take a case. Let everything be in the most favorable shape. A good teacher, regular attendance, good literature, ample time to read and explain the lesson. What is nevertheless true? Less time is devoted to heavenly things than is devoted to any one branch of secular learning. What would a child know of arithmetic, of geography, of grammar or of history, if it received one lesson a week and this lesson "sandwiched" between veritable mountains of wholly different matters? What parent and what teacher would tolerate such a course? This would, however, be more durable in secular than in spiritual

matters. Remember that our understanding in heavenly things is darkened and our will is perverse. It is much more difficult to drive home a truth of the Bible than to teach a child a lesson in arithmetic or any other secular branch. Why then make yourselves believe that one hour a week will balance five days? Those who seriously contend that the Sunday school is all that is needed are dangerously near the line where those stand who despise the Word of God.

How different the arrangement, the opportunities and the impressions found in a properly conducted congregational school. Here the day's work is begun by learning God's Word. The teacher has been trained for this and has prepared for this special lesson. The minds of the children are yet unburdened, and therefore receptive. The hour comes regularly every day, it is a part of the daily routine. The constant application of the truth will make its impression, or do we no more believe that the Word of the Lord will not return to Him void, but will accomplish that whereunto it is sent? The child sees that religious instructions are of importance and it will treat them accordingly.

Which of these plans satisfies you best?

Compare the results as seen in denominations, synods and congregations which have or have not such schools.

Some are surprised at the growth and, if I may so say, cohesiveness of the Roman Catholic Church. Take our city as an example. Sixty years ago the Catholics had not even a single church or priest in Columbus. What have they to-day? They have fourteen churches, three hospitals, two academies, an orphans' asylum, a school for priests, a bishop and a vicar general. How does this come? They took care of their children; they nursed and cradled them and now they are their strength.

Take the strongest Lutheran Synod in America, the Missouri Synod. That body was comparatively late in entering the race. It is the twentieth in point of time. But where is it now? It may "grind" a little to admit it, but it is a fact that it is neck and shoulder and half the side ahead of all the other syonds. Why is this the case? Because from the very beginning they first built up a school and thus fitted and prepared the material for a good congregation. With such material they can oppose unionism, lodgery and intemperance. I am not unmindful of the fact that predestination has found a foot-

hold in this Synod, but I am convinced that an examination of the rank and file of that Synod would reveal the fact that, by reason of their schools, the people hold fast to the Word of God and would, if that Word would be openly and honestly attacked from the pulpits and in the schools, arise against the innovation.

Take it in our own Synod. Where have we our strongest and most influential and reliable congregations? Is it not in those places where we have schools?

If you desire to stand right on the parochial school question, you must often and earnestly think of these things. I am ready to claim that unless you do stand right, there is not the remotest chance of any school being established by you while you may blast the prospects which offer themselves.

In the second place, you must convince your people with regard to parochial schools.

People, like sheep, can be led but seldom driven. When they are once "headed" in the right direction, a little noise and a few obstacles in the way will not readily turn them back. How can we, however, convince people of the necessity of parochial schools?

One thing is certain, this can not be done by denouncing our public schools. We must admit that, in our country, with the endless variety in nationality and creed, public schools are a necessity. We must also admit that, while many flaws and defects in methods and management may be pointed out, these schools can boast of many excellencies. Only he who has zeal without knowledge and is blindly prejudiced, will engage in wholesale denunciations and make himself and the cause of the parochial school odious in the sight of his people.

While admitting the necessity and even the advantages of the public schools, proceed to show parents what God has entrusted to them in their children. Parents must know that children are not mere dolls or playthings, which fond mothers can use to show off rich embroideries and "cute" patterns, but which can be put into the attic when they have lost their novelty. Mothers and fathers must be led to realize that with every child God has entrusted to them a dearly-purchased, immortal soul. These children, their children and generations after them, will rise up on the judgment day to testify for or against parents. Parents can, indeed, not believe for their children. "The just shall live by his faith." But parents

can help to lead their children to faith by teaching them or by having them taught in the Word of God, or they can set hindrances in the way by neglecting and discouraging such instruction.

Show parents also what constitutes real happiness. It is not wealth and not the ability of accumulating wealth. If wealth makes happy, why do rich men suicide and live at enmity and variance with their families? If the ability to make money is the ground for happiness, why does not the well-paid banker show his happiness by being content; but goes on scheming and gambling? If luxuries make happy, why do rich men's brides and wives and children weep and grow wan of trouble and sorrows? It is not wealth nor the ability of gaining wealth that insures happiness. It is a good conscience before God and the consequent hope of eternal life. With these the poor man is happy, without these the rich man is wretched. He, now, who has taught his child how to find forgiveness of sins, and has led this child to faith in Jesus Christ as his Savior, has laid a sure ground for the real, lasting happiness of his child.

If parents admit this, it is not very hard to show them that it is their duty to give their child not the least possible, but the richest measure in their reach, of such teaching as will enable it to grow and remain in faith. What can give a parent more satisfaction, to know that his boy is going to be as rich an heir as Pullman's son, and as bad a man, or to know that his son is a Christian at heart and in life; a Christian whose life is a benediction and whose death is the entrance to the realms of bliss?

When parents recognize the difference between stones and bread, between a scorpion and an egg, hold them to proving their convictions by their actions.

Besides showing parents the necessity of congregational schools, show the congregation the advantage of having such a school.

The future of the congregation rests in the children, this is self-evident. It must, however, be of interest to every member, whether he have children of his own or not, to perpetuate, if at all possible, the Church in which he has received untold blessings. It must be his desire also to have the young members be of as good a character or quality as possible. This will redound to the advantage of the congregation in a financial but above all in a moral and spiritual regard. If a congregation does not rear them and prepare

them, whence shall its future pillars, the elders, the trustees and deacons come? No congregation can in the future point to men who stand in every storm like the forest oaks, if it in the present neglect to plant the acorns.

A school in a congregation is incidentally also a means of keeping the young folks from forming companionships with those of no faith or of a different faith. How many a congregation is weakened by the loss through estrangements. The foundation for such estrangement is very frequently traceable to the acquaintances formed at school. In more than one congregation nine of every ten marriages are with parties outside of their own congregation. This shows plainly enough that the young people find their companions not among those of their own faith, but it shows also plainly enough where a step should be taken to stop such a loss.

A congregational school can in most instances raise the beauty of the service in the house of God by improving the singing. This is by no means a little matter. Good, hearty singing prepares the heart for attentive hearing of the Word. Who has not had sufficient experience to prove this? A properly equipped teacher can and will do much to raise the standard of singing in a congregation. Those who doubt this should go to a church in which the school children attend service and join in the singing with a hearty good will, and should then go to a church in which, at best a few girls and fewer boys are found who instead of joining in the singing are, perhaps, looking for something with which they can engage themselves and annoy their neighbors.

You must also make it clear to a congregation that it is able to have a parochial school. More congregations are financially able to start and sustain such a school than would at first appear. They may be spending money on things in themselves desirable, but not at all necessary. Take, for example, an extravagant church with fine pews, an elegant carpet, costly windows, rich drapery, a *ne plus ultra* organ, heavy bells, a "sky-scraping" steeple, a hired choir, a chorister and organist, solid silver and gold-lined communion vessels, a fine silk gown and the like more. Add to this the interest which some congregations are paying on borrowed money, money which should and could long since have been paid, and you will find that many a congregation which pleads inability to support a school could do so without laying a single new dollar on the sum already paid out each year. The aim should be to have the expenses of the school paid out of the general funds of the congregation. It should

not be required that the school support itself by charging a tuition. In this way the people who have large families, and often small incomes, are made to furnish the advantages found for the congregation at large in a teacher, while those who enjoy these advantages, but have no children, are left without an opportunity of using their means in one of the most blessed and effectual missionary enterprises.

Where it is impossible to support a teacher, the pastor should take the work into his own hands. Of course, this is no little task, but it is worth the labor. A day spent in the school-room in the midst of the children and spent in sowing the seed of the Word will always redound in greater good for the individuals and the congregation taken collectively than two days, yes, than half a dozen days spent in aimless "social" visiting among the people. Carry the lambs in your bosom and the sheep will follow without any special effort.

Besides studying the finances and removing other seeming hindrances to the starting of a school, see to it that you have a proper plan and course of study. Some people raise well-grounded objections to some parochial schools, because of their inefficiency. There seems to be no order and no method or aim in the whole affair. Because a thing is old, it does not, therefore, become excellent. Because a certain book or course or method is found in a public school, we need not on that account cast it aside. It will be to our advantage if we keep an eye on the branches and the grades found in the schools around us, even if we do not follow in the tracks of these schools. It won't hurt to have examinations or tests, printed reports, closing exercises and other matters little in themselves, but helping to make a school look like "business."

While attending to yourselves and while working with your people, you must,

In the third place, never forget to seek the help and guidance of God.

You will right frequently need this help. You will need it to keep yourselves in line. It is no little matter to be working against popular opinion. The starting and conducting of a parochial school is not a popular thing. A man can readily be called a crank, a fossil, a narrow-minded, religious bigot, and any number of other similar names. This is not pleasant to the flesh even of a minister. But few men are so constituted that they will remain unmoved, when

the voices around them cry: "Great are our public schools, and every one is un-American who does not shout with us."

It requires grace also to practice the necessary self-denials. These are right apt to come in the shape of increased labors and reduced income. It is a mistake if you should think that having a school will give you an abundance of time to devote to all sorts of "hobby raising and feeding." The pastor must visit the school, he must see why this or that one does not come to school. He will, indeed, have more work with a school than without it. So it may require that he suffer his salary to be reduced in order to help in keeping a teacher. He may think he needs his full amount, he may be morally convinced that the congregation could support a teacher without reducing his own salary, but he is obliged to take more work and less support to get matters into working order. But to load up and to cut off is not pleasant to the flesh and we, therefore, need the grace of God to practice the needed self-denial.

A large measure of compatibility is needed to prevent undesirable friction between the pastor and teacher. There is danger that a pastor forget himself and climb so far up in his dignity that he does no more see his teacher. He may also become so sensitive that little or nothing will cause him to fret. Whence, however, shall he get the needed humility, patience and endurance? These virtues are found among the good gifts which come down from above and must be asked for of God.

You will need the Lord's help to keep the teacher in line. Teachers are human beings. They have weaknesses, even though they be earnest Christians. They may sometimes forget that not everybody belongs to their pupils and that their code of rules applies to the school-room only. They may also grow weary of work if their work is not appreciated as it should be. This is, sad to say, oftener the case than some may think. Who really thinks of the worry and work, of the expenditure of patience and force which a teacher is obliged to undergo? It requires divine aid to keep a teacher at work in his noble calling. You need God to do this. You will need the Lord's help to keep your people in line.

Pride and avarice will assert themselves again and again. People want to be among the "upper classes." Their children shall be there also. In the congregational school, they can't make much display. They can't get into "society." Hence they will not send their children.

Sometimes they find that such a school costs too much. As often as they see a dollar paid out for the school, they consider it lost. They figure up every item and conclude that it is a waste of means. These notions do not come alone when a school is being started, they will come about once a year. What can be done? Such people can be placed into no better hands than God's. He can break their miserable pride, perhaps by laying their child into a coffin or marring its beauty and attractiveness. He can open their purses so wide that their whole possessions drop out. He can also fill hearts with that faith which looks up and heeds no more this earth with its vanities. Hence we need this God to keep our people in line.

These are the lines which I would point out to you, if you desire to start a parochial school. May the Lord who has a tender heart for our children also bless every effort put forth to feed these lambs.

NOTES.

PALESTINE. — About two years ago there was discovered in the ruins of a Byzantine Basilica in Madaba, a portion of an excellent mosaic map of Palestine, which proves to be one of the best archæological finds of the present decade. The map constituted the floor of the church and at one time included the entire length and breadth of the Holy Land, but owing to the devastations of the Arabs centuries ago, about two-thirds of this grand chart has been destroyed. A good description, as also interesting data furnished by a careful study of the chart, is found in the Scientific Supplement (Beilage) to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, of Munich, No. 36, from the pen of Dr. A. Schulten. The date of the mosaic chart is the sixth century after Christ, although its purpose is not to give a picture of the Palestine of that period, but rather of the Palestine of the Old Testament period, with more incidental references to the career of Christ and the New Testament times. In beautiful colors it marks the leading geographical points, cities, rivers, hills, villages, chapels, churches, and even such localities as the tree of Abraham at Mamre, together with the names of each and all of these. The picture of Jerusalem is exceptionally good and complete, and at the same time is the oldest in ex-

istence. In fact it is the oldest chart of a city on record, as the oldest map of Rome dates from the thirteenth century. This whole Madaba chart is also the oldest chart extant, as the Peutinger road chart of the Roman Empire is a copy made in the eighth century of an original dating in the fourth century. That the Madaba chart is a product of no later a period than the sixth century, is evident from the fact that it pictures Jerusalem and its surroundings as these existed prior to the destruction by the Persians in 614. A fairly good reproduction of this mosaic map was published in twelve fac simile plates by the French scholar, Germer-Durand, but a new edition is promised by the German Palestine Society.

GERMANY. — To what extent the Catholic Church in Germany makes use of her powerful organization and ecclesiastical machinery for political purposes, was again demonstrated at the recent elections in Bavaria, where the clericals gained from the liberals no less than twenty-three additional seats in the parliament at Munich. During the ante-election agitation the Catholic clergy was exceedingly active, and scarcely a meeting of the Centre or Catholic party was reported without the stereotyped statement that this or that priest or higher ecclesiastic had presided. Shortly before election there appeared in the New Bavarian *Zeitung*, the official organ of this party, the following admonitions addressed to the clergy: No Catholic clergyman will desecrate his pulpit if he from this place appeals to the faithful and admonishes them a) that the elections are an occasion on which fidelity to faith and the church, as well as to the country, can be exhibited; b) that it is a violation of a believer's duty not to take part in the election; c) that every Catholic and patriot has the duty to cast his vote only for such a man who will really advance the interests of the church and of the fatherland; and d) that the women should take all opportunities, especially on election day, to be diligent in prayer for good elections, and should send their husbands to the polls, and not, as has been done, prevent them from going.

The result of this agitation has been an overwhelming victory for the clerical party, and the liberals hold only forty-five seats now in Munich.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

Vol. XIX.

DECEMBER, 1899.

No. 6.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

BRIEFLY EXPLAINED BY PROF. F. W. STELLHORN, D. D.,
COLUMBUS, O.

CHAPTER X.

THE JEWS THEMSELVES ARE THE CAUSE OF THEIR OWN REJECTION.

A. *The only Way to Salvation they would not go, that is, the Way of Faith in Christ:* Verses 1-18.

Notwithstanding the rejection of the Jews, which the Apostle cannot but call deserved, he hopes that his readers in brotherly love believe him when he expresses the pleasure of his very heart and his supplication to God in behalf of the Jews to be directed towards their salvation (1). For they had, as he gladly acknowledges to their honor,

V. 1. This verse, as also the whole chapter, is closely connected with the last verses of the preceding chapter, as is already apparent from *αδρῶν*, instead of *Ιεραγῆ* or a noun of like importance (comp. 9, 31) to which it simply refers. "Brethren": an appeal to the brotherly love of the readers, not an expression of affection for the Jews who are not addressed here (comp. 8, 12 where the case is different). *Μέν* introduces what is found with Paul, but points to a following *δέ* introducing what on the part of the Jews stands in the way and hinders the realization of the Apostle's desire and supplication. This *δέ* does not follow because in v. 2 the construction is changed by inserting an explanatory sentence, which again in v. 3 is followed by a similar sentence; but the substance of the sentence that *δέ* should have introduced is given in v. 3. "The pleasure of my heart": nothing would have pleased and rejoiced his heart more; *his heart* (*εμῆς* emphatic, not

their excellency before all other nations, namely a zeal for God and His services that was found nowhere else, though unfortunately it was not guided and ruled by a correct understanding of the will and ways of God (2). For they did not know, and did not want to know, the righteousness that God alone can bestow, and which is the only one that avails before Him, and tried to set up a righteousness acquired, as they thought, by themselves through the observance of the Law; and hence they did not submit to the divine arrangement concerning man's justification and salvation (3). For since Christ has come, fulfilling the Law, it manifestly is no more to be regarded a way to righteousness; Christ and His fulfilment of the Law accepted by faith, or faith accepting Christ and His merits, is the only way (4). Nor can Law and faith be combined

simply the enclitic *μου*), though appearances might seem to be against him (comp. 9, 1 sqq.). "The supplication"= my supplication, the definite article in Greek standing for the possessive pronoun when the latter is not needed for clearness or emphasis. "My supplication to God for them" is best taken together as none of these modifications fit to "pleasure"; "(is) unto salvation"=has for its object their salvation, belongs to both "pleasure" and "supplication".

V. 2. Something subjective that commends them is mentioned here, whilst 9, 4 sq. objective prerogatives are enumerated. Θεοῦ objective genetive: *for* God (comp. Acts 22, 3). Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ σκιτῆλοι θεοῦ ἔχουσιν. *Kat'* ἐπίγνωσιν: "in accordance with a correct knowledge"; such a knowledge was not the norm and rule that they followed in the possession and manifestation of their zeal.

V. 3. Comp. 9, 31 sq. "The righteousness of God": comp. 1, 17; 3, 21 sq. Israel's ignorance was their own fault. "Their own righteousness": comp. Phil. 3, 9. "They did not subject themselves", did not submit, obey (*ὑπετάγησαν* is here the middle voice, not the passive; comp. 8, 7; 13, 1;—8, 20). "The righteousness of God" is here regarded as a divine order and arrangement made for the salvation of men to which all those that desire to be saved must simply submit—a manifest proof that saving grace does not work irresistibly but requires the omission of wilful resistance (comp. v. 16; 1, 5; Acts 6, 7).

V. 4. *Tάρ* introduces the explanation why the conduct of the Jews was not the correct one, could not lead to true righteousness. *Τέλος* in this connection is best taken in the sense of "end", termination (not fulfilment, or purpose). Law (*νόμου* without the article), since Christ has come and fulfilled His mission on earth, does no more take the place that it took in the Old Testament.

in this respect; for Moses himself states that a man that wants to live by the righteousness of the Law must first acquire it himself by keeping the Law (5; comp. Lev. 18, 5; Gal. 3, 12), whilst the righteousness obtained by faith is already acquired and at hand. The latter fact the Apostle

times: there it predominated and ruled, preparing men for the appearance of Christ, though it could not save men itself; but since Christ has come, fulfilling the Law in all its directions and commandments, whether moral or ceremonial, it must give place to the Gospel as the dominating factor and the only guide to heaven. Thus Christ is the "end of law" because He has fulfilled it in our stead so that it can no more accuse and condemn us, though, as a matter of course, the essence of the moral law, being the revelation of the unchangeable will of God with regard to the character and conduct of all His human creatures, is still to be the norm and guide of our life. Hence there is no contradiction between this passage and the statement of Christ Matt. 5, 17. "Unto righteousness": this is the purpose of Christ's being the end of the Law. His fulfilment of the Law was to procure and has procured righteousness, the requisite that man had to have to please God, and could not have by his own exertion; and this righteousness is intended for every man, but can become his and benefit him only when apprehended and appropriated by faith. Everyone that believes in Christ receives and enjoys this righteousness, but nobody else. Faith determines man's standing with God and his eternal fate, not because of its own merits—it is on the contrary itself the most emphatic confession of the entire lack of all merits on our part—but because it is the only means of apprehending and appropriating the righteousness Christ has procured for us.

V. 5. The connection between this verse and verses 6 and the following shows that the Apostle means to prove that the righteousness of the Law and the righteousness of faith are diametrically opposed to each other with regard to origin and source as well as to possibility and facility of acquirement. Hence the one supersedes and displaces the other; and hence Christ is the end of law as a source of righteousness. As to our present verse the question is whether *δι* should be read after *γράφει* or after *νόμου*. In the former case *τὴν δικαιοσύνην* *κτλ.* is the object of *ποιησάς* and is emphatically placed before its governing verb because of the opposition between the twofold righteousness; in the latter case *τὴν δικαιοσύνην* is the object of *γράφει*. The literal translation would be respectively: "Moses writes that the man that doeth the righteousness of the Law will live in it;" or, "Moses writes concerning the righteousness of the Law that the man that doeth" (it, or, as some copies insert, *αὐτά*, "them," i. e., the

states in words ascribed to this righteousness itself, and in a free way, with some necessary variations, borrowed from a passage of the Old Testament that speaks of the Law (Deut. 30, 11-14), the Law and the righteousness of faith having this in common that they were given to man without any exertion or merit on his part, a free gift of God that simply has to be received and treated as such. As the Apostle applies these words they say that there is no need for any extraordinary or perhaps even impossible exertion on the part of man to acquire the righteousness of faith. There is no necessity of going up to heaven in order to bring it down; for to assume that would be acting as if Christ had not yet come down upon earth to obtain it (6). Nor is there any need of going down to the depths of the earth for it; for that would be denying that Christ has already arisen from the dead, proving thereby to have fully acquired the righteousness necessary for us (7; comp. 4, 25). So the righteousness of faith does not tell us to do impossible and unnecessary things in order to acquire it; on the contrary, it declares that the word containing and offering this righteousness already acquired by Christ, is near and with us so that we can speak and meditate about it, that is, the Gospel that requires nothing but faith

requirements of the Law), "will live in it." In the latter case δέ can be regarded as *recitativum* and therefore be omitted. In either case, however, δέ ποτείσας has the main emphasis: the Law, in order to make a man just and confer life upon him, must be done, observed, kept, and this perfectly (comp. Deut. 27, 26; Gal. 3, 10; James 2, 10).

V. 6. "Do not say in thy heart" = do not entertain the perverse and impious thought (comp. Psalm 14, 1; Matt. 3, 9; Rev. 18, 7). "Who will ascend into heaven?" That would be impossible, but is also unnecessary. "That is to bring Christ down" = that is just as foolish as if a man thought Christ had still to be brought down from heaven to obtain righteousness for us.

V. 7. To be understood in a similar way as the preceding verse. This despairing question is just as foolish as the former "Abyss": the reverse of heaven, the lowest depth (comp. Job 11, 8; Psalm 107, 26; 139, 8; Amos 9, 2). Christ was there after his death, the word denoting in general the common receptacle of the dead, and especially the abode of Satan and the demons (comp. Luke 8, 31; Rev. 9, 1 sq. 11; 11, 7; 17, 8; 20, 1, 3; compare also the Hebrew שָׁאָל, e. g. Deut. 32, 22; Isa. 14, 9; Job 14, 13; Psalm 16, 10; 116, 8).

to obtain what it contains and offers (8). For nothing else is needed for salvation but to confess Christ as our Lord and Savior and to believe that God, by raising Him from the dead, Himself has declared Him to be such (9). Whoever truly has this faith dwelling in his heart, and then, as a matter of course, also confesses it by word and deed (Matt. 12, 34), he is in possession of the righteousness necessary unto salvation, and therefore of salvation itself

V. 8. "But what does it say?" As if v. 6 had begun: "But the righteousness that is from faith does not say, Say in thy heart, etc." The mode of expression changes. The interrogative form of the sentence is intended to excite attention. "The word of faith": the word that speaks of faith, namely, as the only requisite on man's part ($\tauῆς πίστεως$ is the objective genitive). "Which we preach": which is the burden of my preaching as well as of that of all true and faithful ministers of Christ, and therefore in the reach of all men, first of all the Jews.

V. 9. *Οὐτε*: because, proving that the Gospel really contains and offers the righteousness that is already acquired, nothing being necessary but accepting what it says, confessing and believing it. Confession and faith cannot be separated; where the latter is the former naturally follows. Confession is here mentioned first because the order of the words in v. 8 is followed, where "mouth," wherewith confession is made, precedes "heart," wherein faith dwells. *Κύριος*: as Lord, a predicate to *Ἰησοῦν* which is the direct object of *δομοληγήσῃς* (comp. Phil. 2, 11; 1 Cor. 8, 6; 12, 3). "Lord": in the sense of the Second Article of the Creed. *Σωθῆσῃς* comp. v. 13.

V. 10. *Γάρ*: proves that the explanation that v. 9 gives of the passage cited in v. 8 is correct. The "heart," the center of personal and spiritual life, is the seat of faith, wherever it is what it ought to be; the "mouth" naturally is the first means of confession. Here Paul returns to the natural order, placing the faith of the heart before the confession of the mouth. As confession is the necessary consequence of faith, so salvation of righteousness; therefore faith and righteousness, the two respective causes, are connected on the one hand and put first, and confession and salvation, the two respective results, are put together on the other hand and come last. The two clauses are an imitation of Hebrew parallelism, and that synthetical parallelism where ideas and thoughts that belong together and constitute one whole are, for the sake of emphasis, separated and distributed in two or more parallel passages (comp. Psalm 19, 7-10). The sense here is: "The faith of the heart, followed by the confession of the mouth, results in righteousness and salvation."

(10). Hence true faith in reality is the only requisite for every man (11; comp. 9, 33); for with regard to justification and salvation there is not the least difference between men, whether they be Jews or gentiles: there is only one and the same Savior for all of them, Christ Jesus, whose riches of righteousness and grace are inexhaustible, if men only call upon Him for what they need (12). For He is the very Lord and God of whom the prophet declares (Joel 2, 32 [3, 5]) that everyone who takes refuge in Him in accordance with His gracious revelation and self-manifestation, will be saved (13).

B. Through the Gospel the Jews also should have come to Faith in Christ: Verses 14-21.

To call upon the Lord is necessary unto salvation (comp. 13). But in order to do this man must have come to believe in Christ; for that again hearing of Christ and His work is necessary, and for this the preaching of the Gospel and the sending of such preachers. And all this has been done: messengers that bring the blessed, heart-rejoicing

V. 11. This verse proves that in the preceding verses confession of mouth is added to faith of heart simply because it is the natural consequence of the latter, not as if it were on a level with it as a second (instrumental) cause of justification and salvation. *Πᾶς* is added to *δι πιστεύων*, though found neither in the Hebrew original nor in the Septuagint translation, because it is contained in it, and the idea is to be emphasized: faith is the one thing absolutely necessary for salvation. "On Him": Christ (comp. 9, 33). *Κατασχυθήσεται*, future tense, comp. v. 13.

V. 12. *Γάρ*: proves that *πᾶς* in v. 11 is rightly emphasized. *Τε καὶ* emphasizes *"Ἐλληνος*: not only among Jews, the covenant people of the Old Testament, is there no distinction and difference with regard to the absolute need and sufficiency of faith, but not even between a Jew and a gentile; all men, wherein they may differ otherwise, are alike in this. *Κύριος πάντων* is predicate: "for the same one," viz. Christ, "is Lord of all." "Lord" as in v. 9. "Is rich," viz., in that which is needed for salvation (comp. John 1, 14, 16). "That call upon Him": as a natural result of their believing in Him.

V. 13. Calling on Jesus Christ in prayer, according to this passage, stands on a level, yea, is identical, with calling on the Lord God, because He is the Lord God in personal revelation and human form, the God of salvation promised by the Old Testament.

Gospel to sin-forlorn men have been sent by God in accordance with the prophecy of Isaiah (52, 7) that in the first place speaks of the deliverance from the Babylonian captivity, which, however, was a type of the deliverance from the bondage of sin and Satan through Christ (14 sq.). But the trouble with the Jews was that the great majority of them did not in obedience to God receive the Gospel, and hence did not come to faith, as already Isaiah had to complain concerning the reception of his prophetic preaching (16; comp. Isa. 53, 1). For the divinely-ordained

Praying to Christ is as characteristic of the New Testament as praying to the Lord was of the Old (comp. also Gen. 4, 26; 12, 8, Psalm 79, 6; 105, 1; Isa. 64, 7; Acts 9, 14; 1 Cor. 1, 2; Phil. 2, 10 sq.; — John 5, 23). “The name of the Lord”: the Lord in accordance with His revelation, not any imaginary supreme being according to human fancies and speculations. *Σωθήσεται*: the future tense to indicate the infallible consequence, as also the perfect enjoyment of the salvation already possessed here as a matter of the future (comp. vv. 9 and 11).

V. 14. *Πῶς*: how is it possible that — a rhetorical question denoting impossibility. *Ἐπικαλέσωνται*, *πιστεύσωσιν*, *ἀκούσωσιν*, *κηρύξωσιν* the deliberative subjunctive usual in rhetorical questions of this kind, for which also the future indicative can be used. After *ἐπικαλέσωνται* supply *τοῦτον*. The subject are those that by calling on the name of the Lord are to be saved, viz. man in general, all men. If in the next clause *οὐ* is taken as an adverb = *where* (comp. 4, 15; 5, 20), nothing is to be supplied after *πιστεύσωσιν*; but if *οὐ* is regarded as the genitive of *δέ* governed by *ἔχουσσιν*, a construction not impossible but improbable in this connection, *εἰς τοῦτον* must be supplied. It cannot be urged in favor of the latter construction that conformity with the preceding clause requires it; for the clauses following have also a different form of expression, not needing any supplement.

V. 15. The prophetic passage cited above shows that the requirements mentioned in the preceding sentences have been met, and that we can, and should, rejoice in this. The literal translation of the citation is: “How beautiful are the feet of those that bring the joyful tidings of that which is good” = how welcome and gladdening is the coming of messengers that announce the soul-rejoicing news that those things that alone can benefit and save us have been acquired and can be had for the mere asking and acceptance, viz. forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation (*τὸ δικαθάρα*, comp. 7, 7).

V. 16. “Not all,” viz. of them that heard the Gospel, especially the Jews to whom the divine messengers with their joyful

way to come to faith is preaching based on the command and institution of Christ to preach the Gospel (17). But is it not perhaps that the Jews did not at all hear the preaching of this Gospel? That cannot be, since the Gospel had been preached by the apostles and their assistants in the

tidings were sent in the first place. "Not all": a litotes, for "the great majority." "Were disobedient to the Gospel" = "did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God," v. 3. The Gospel contains and offers this righteousness; this is the order and arrangement made by God Himself, and it must be obeyed by every man that wants to be justified and saved. The obedience consists in simply accepting by faith the righteousness offered and the other benefits dependent thereon—an obedience as easy in itself as repugnant to the sinful and withal self-righteous human heart. Isaiah's complaint was typical and prophetical of the times of the Messiah concerning whom the whole chapter (53) from which it is taken speaks. Isaiah was the Evangelist of the Old Testament, speaking of the Messiah that was to come, especially of His sufferings and death, as if he had been an eye and ear witness; the reception of his preaching on the part of the Jews could therefore well be indicative of the reception they would accord to the Gospel announcing that the Messiah had come. *Άκον*: the act of hearing; the thing heard; the report, communication, narrative concerning what has been heard. Either one of the two latter significations fits here: "that which we have heard" as a divine revelation, or "our report" concerning this; the latter, however, seems to be preferable since the *preaching* of the divine message is presupposed in this whole section (vv. 15-18). "Our preaching" then must mean in the first place that of Isaiah and his fellow-prophets, in the New Testament application that of the apostles and their assistants and successors. "Who has believed?" again a rhetorical question, identical with the negative statement, No one, or, not many (comp. v. 14).

V. 17. *Η πίστις*: "the faith," the only one deserving this name, the only one that can save. Supply *ἐστίν* or *γίνεται* (is, or, comes). "Through the word of Christ", or rather, "through a word of Christ" (*ρῆμα* without the article): *διά* can hardly have the same meaning as *εἰς* in the preceding clause, and in that case *εἰς* would most likely be repeated (though Paul likes to change the expression, comp. 3, 25. 26: *εἰς* and *πρός*; 30: *εἰς* and *διά*). So it would seem that the safest explanation is: preaching comes through a word, *i. e.*, a command (comp. Luke 3, 2; Hebr. 11, 3), of Christ—the Gospel is preached because Christ has commanded and instituted such preaching. Consequently disobedience to the preaching of the Gospel is disobedience to a command and institution

whole world, had consequently come also to the knowledge of the Jews, even in their dispersion among other nations (18). But perhaps Israel did not understand what the Gospel meant? That cannot be, since already Moses (Deut. 32, 21) prophesied that heathen nations, naturally not having the ability to understand the word of God as Israel had it, would come to know God by the preaching of His Gospel and through their reception by God as His People would be a cause of jealousy to Israel (19); and Isaiah (65, 1 sq.)

of Christ, hence to Christ, the only one that can save us, Himself, and therefore cannot but condemn. Luthardt explains: "A divine word forms the basis of the human preaching, the revelation of God in the form of the word — hence the omission of the article —, which, therefore, requires faith as the correlate conduct." But, in the first place, he forgets that in his own opinion "word of *Christ*", and not "word of *God*", is the true reading, and that the former expression would not necessarily include any opposition to anything human; and, in the second place, he does not prove that *διά* can denote the basis in the sense in which he means this. To be sure, when Christ instituted the holy ministry, He commanded His apostles and their assistants and successors to preach the Gospel, nothing else (Matt. 28, 19; Mark 16, 15); and hence the preaching that is based on Christ's word of command and institution is, and must be, the preaching of the Gospel, out of which preaching alone faith comes. Thus finally we obtain the same sense as if *διά* were taken as having the same meaning as *ἐξ*, but in the only proper, though somewhat circuitous, way.

V. 18. "But" introduces an objection that might be raised as an excuse for the unbelief of the Jews. Paul himself gives expression to this objection in order to refute it immediately ("I say"); and already the form in which he gives it, a question to which a negative answer is expected, shows that he does not regard the objection valid: "Did they perhaps not hear it (the preaching)??" = must we really assume that they did not hear it? The answer implied by *μη* (= *num*) is, No, we must not assume that. *Μενοῦνγε*: nay, rather (comp. 9, 20). What really has taken place and refutes the above objection Paul clothes in the words of Psalm 19, 5, cited according to the Septuagint, which speak of the universality of the natural revelation. As the heavens everywhere declare the glory of God so the preachers of the Gospel have everywhere proclaimed justification by faith in Christ.

V. 19. A new objection raised by Paul himself for the same reason and purpose as the preceding one, and in the same form. After *ἔγνω* again *τὴν ἀληφὴν* must be supplied. "Israel" is to be emphasized: Israel of all others. "First Moses": he, the founder of the Israelitish theocracy, was also the first — he

had the boldness and courage in the midst of a nation so jealous of their prerogatives to predict that God would be found even by men that did not seek for Him as the Jews did. Consequently, it must have been possible also for Israel with its religious training and experience to understand the preaching of the Gospel and to come to faith thereby (20). No, the cause of Israel's unbelief and rejection was an entirely different one; the fault was altogether their own, as also Isaiah expressed it in the passage just cited: their willful disobedience and resistance set at naught all the grace God granted them for their conversion and salvation (21).

already. That ought to convince the people that the fault was theirs, inherent in their very nature from the very beginning. "I": emphatic; over against the Jews who had "moved" God "to jealousy with that which is not God", worshiping idols, He, on His part, threatened, "I will move you to jealousy with (lit. upon) a non-nation", *i. e.*, people not a nation in the eyes of God, not meeting His demands, not knowing and following His will. From this view only the people of Israel were a nation. As to the idea of God's provoking the Jews to jealousy and anger by receiving the heathen as His people compare 11, 11.

V. 20. Isaiah: the greatest prophet after Moses. The whole citation is free after the Septuagint, and also that part that is cited in this verse seems in the original to refer to the disloyal people of Israel, but it is so much the more applicable to the heathen (comp. 9, 25 sq.). "I": God speaks through the prophet. "That asked not of me", viz. instruction and guidance. *Τοῖς ζητοῦσιν = ὅπδ τῶν ζητούσιν.*

V. 21. "I spread out my hands": to receive them when penitent.

THESES ON THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

BY REV. J. SHEATSLEY, DELAWARE, O.

(Read before the Columbus English Conference and published by request.)

Of all the precepts of the Decalogue none has received so much consideration as the third, or, according to the Hellenistic count followed by the Reformed churches, the fourth. Much of this discussion, however, is of a legalistic bias and more or less fanatical. The third commandment as instituted by Moses contains, besides the purely moral and spiritual, also a ceremonial element, and it is this especially that has both given occasion to endless dis-

cussion, and also formed the basis for an external observance and righteousness, much emphasized by those legalistically inclined. That there is much fanaticism here is seen already by this that many of these legalists who assert, for example, the perpetual divine obligation of the seventh day at the same time lay claim to sinless perfection or develop other absurdities. Heresy in one doctrine will appear in others. But the object of the present discussion is not to review at length what has been said amiss on the third commandment, but to determine what it means for us who are seeking to be saved alone by grace through faith in Christ. The command has a practical bearing for Christians which one cannot well exaggerate, and it is this practical element rather than theory that we shall try to set forth. However, we cannot properly point out the practical use of the command, if we do not understand its very nature. We need, therefore, to go back to the original institution of the Sabbath, and see what purpose the divine mind had in view in sanctifying the seventh day. The first thesis will accordingly have to do with this feature of the subject.

THESIS I.

THE DIVINE ORIGINAL PURPOSE OF THE SABBATH IS REST.

1. *The institution of the Sabbath is divine.* No one who believes the Bible to be God's word will deny this. Not all may concede that the day was promulgated among men already in Paradise, when the Lord rested from all His work on the seventh day and 'blessed it'. But even if its promulgation dates only from the time of Moses, its enactment is no less divine, for Moses enacted only what the Lord directed him to enact. The question, however, as to the divine origin of the Sabbath, or third commandment, is more than merely a question of fact. If the Sabbath is a divine institution and is in force at the present also, though it be in a somewhat changed form, then it follows that the third commandment, whatever its meaning for us may be, is of divine obligation, just as much so as the first or any other of the holy decalogue. We may be able to show that the Mosaic Sabbath contained ceremonial elements and that these have passed away through their fulfillment in Christ, but what remains does so by virtue of God's original institution and has the same binding force now as at the beginning. The practical inference then is this that, if the sanctification of the Sabbath consists chiefly

in hearing and learning God's Word as Luther explains it, then we are just as much in duty bound to hear and learn God's Word as to fear God above all things, or to honor father and mother, or not to steal or kill. This point bears emphasizing, for there seem to be many even among Christians who think it a terrible thing to kill or steal or get drunk or contemn authority, but feel little or no compunction when they neglect to learn God's Word. We are of course conscious here of the fact that there is a difference between the obligation of the third commandment and that of the second table of the law where the so-called natural rights are involved. Yet in each case it is God's will that calls for obedience.

2. *The Sabbath was instituted in connection with the creation.* "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the sabbath day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." (Gen. 2, 2, 3). Likewise when the decalogue was promulgated through Moses among the children of Israel God's resting on the seventh day is again given as the ground for the Sabbath. "But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it" (Ex. 20, 10, 11). And again when the Lord, speaking to Moses, declared the Sabbath to be a perpetual covenant between Him and His people He likewise based its institution upon the seventh day of the creation week, saying, "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day He rested and was refreshed." For the entire section see Ex. 31, 12-17. In the second version of the decalogue as given in Deuteronomy the deliverance from Egypt is made the ground for Israel's observance of the Sabbath: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath" (Deut. 5, 15). This passage however does not in any sense inviolate the force of the original passages in Genesis and Exodus; it only makes an application to

the case of Israel of the Sabbath which the Lord had already instituted. The above are the chief passages bearing on this particular point, and the proof seems conclusive that the institution of the Sabbath is connected with the creation week and is based upon the seventh day as the day of rest.

This of course does not decide the question yet whether the Sabbath was actually promulgated for observance already in the garden of Eden, or whether this was first done at a later day. Students of the Bible are divided on this point, for the Scripture record concerning the institution of the Sabbath seems to leave this particular point in the dark, so that one cannot be absolutely sure which to affirm. The first reference to the Sabbath after the account thereof in Genesis is found in Exodus 16, 22-30, in connection with the gathering of manna: Moses told the people to gather a double portion on the sixth day and to gather none on the seventh, since it "is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord." But whether it is implied that the people up to this time knew nothing of the Sabbath, or that Moses simply meant to remind them of the day already in force, lest they thoughtlessly transgress, is hard to say. The incident at least shows this that the day was in force before the promulgation of the decalogue on Sinai. So also the word "remember" in the formal command, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," is taken by some to mean that the day existed previously and that the people are now reminded of its existence, while others hold the sense to be that from date they should not forget the observance of the day. Gerhard sees in the word "remember" a divinely intended stimulus for our lethargic hearts that are so prone to forget meditating upon God's Word. The question however does not appear to be of great practical importance and therefore we pass on.

3. *The Sabbath is a day of rest.* The etymological meaning of the Hebrew word *Shabbot* is unquestionably that of *rest*, cessation from labor. This is also its actual meaning. On the Sabbath man and beast should rest from labor and during the sabbatic year the land also should rest. That such is the meaning of the Sabbath is especially clear from the words of the Lord Himself in the passages quoted above, where He expressly states that on the seventh day He rested from all His work and that He blessed the day for that reason. This much then is clear, but it is not so clear just what is meant by this rest both with respect to God and with respect to man. In the case of God it is evident, first of all, that this rest is not mere passivity and inactivity, or

a kind of divine idleness. In that sense God never rests. "My Father works hitherto, and I work," said Jesus. As to its negative side then God's rest on the seventh day can mean cessation only from a particular kind of work, viz., His specific creative work. In six days He created all things and with the close of the sixth day that kind of work forever ended. As to the positive side this rest of God consists in the holy self-satisfaction and pleasure which He finds in the perfect work of His hands. When we have finished a work we rest from it and enjoy the blessing it contains. God said of all His works that they were "very good," they met His complete approval and He found pleasure in them. He therefore blessed the seventh day, for it was the real fruit of His creative work: "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which He had created and made."

There is a point here which we are apt to overlook, viz., that the Sabbath was not made for man alone, but also for the Lord Himself. God rested on the Sabbath day. It is especially called "the sabbath of the *Lord thy God*." The *Lord* rests, finds pleasure in contemplating His creatures. Of these creatures man is the chief, being created in God's own image. In man then God must find His chief delight in His perpetual Sabbath. Man is not that perfect image of God as is the Son of God, says Sartorius, "but yet God's sabbatic joy over His completed creation consists just therein that now also in the little created personality, in the self-conscious soul of earthly man, the divine love and glory, which blesses and sanctifies, is reflected and transfigures the earthly life." Jesus evidently had in mind this same rest of God in man when He said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14, 23). "And this," says Sartorius again, "is the holy, acceptable, force-giving rest of God with which He keeps the Sabbath in man; that He blesses and sanctifies, which while resting in His highest activity. Surely then the Sabbath and its cultus is not only for man, but also for God, who realizes in man the purpose of His creation."

It should be noted further that God rested *after* the work was done. If one has done no work, there is nothing to rest from. Oehler in his theology of the Old Testament says, "The Sabbath has its signification only as the seventh day, preceded by six days of labor. The first part of the command, Ex. 20, 9, to hallow the Sabbath, is itself equally a command: 'Six days shalt thou labor and do all that

thou hast to do, but the seventh is the sabbath of the Lord thy God.' Thus it is only upon the *foundation of preceding labor in our vocation*, that the rest of the Sabbath is to be reared: The saying, Gen. 3, 19, 'In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread,' remains in force." Where no work has been done there is neither labor to rest from nor fruit of labor to rest in.

Summing up then the sabbatic rest with reference to God we find this, that, having finished His creative work, God now rests by contemplating the work of His hands and finding holy satisfaction and pleasure in the reflection of His own goodness in His creatures, chiefly in man, reflecting His own image.

But what is the sabbatic rest for man? The Lord when He created man gave him a work to do. "God said unto him, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." And when God had planted the garden of Eden He put Adam into it "to dress it and to keep it." This was not creative work like God's, but it was work. Now while engaged in this work man had to associate with creatures, and none of these creatures, not even the woman who was specially created for man, could ever afford man that satisfaction and rest that his soul, stamped with God's image, longed for. This happiness he could find alone in the conscious fellowship with God his Maker. God therefore instituted the Sabbath that man might rest from labor and give himself exclusively to contemplation on God, or the exercise of his immediate fellowship with Him. On this point Sartorius says, "And as God in man, so also has man only in God his rest, his holiday, his peace. In the days on which he is commanded to work he is to engage in his manifold daily labor by means of which he subdues the earth unto himself, and on the holiday he is to turn back from these distracting labors that neither can nor were meant to give him rest, and compose himself in God who, since He alone can fill and still the divine affiliated heart of man, alone also can give him holy rest, who indeed himself is man's rest, his peace, his sabbath, as also it is said of Christ in the New Testament 'He is our peace' (Eph. 2, 14). To seek and find rest for the soul in the works or creatures of God, or even in one's own human works, instead of in God, is idolatry. To rest in the flesh, that is called sleeping or also dreaming; but to rest in God, that is called keeping holiday (feiern), and

such rest alone sanctifies the holy day." This sabbatic rest of man has of course been disturbed through sin, yet this is the rest we look forward to through Christ, this is the rest that remains for the people of God (Heb. 4:9). The practical bearing of these observations will become more evident when we come to consider the Sabbath under the New Covenant.

We pass on now to the second thesis which deals with the Mosaic Sabbath.

THESIS II.

THE MOSAIC SABBATH HAS A CEREMONIAL SETTING.

1. By "setting" we mean this that the original idea of the Sabbath is taken and is limited, surrounded, or hedged in with certain transient and ceremonial conditions. A diamond is a diamond, no matter what its setting may be, and yet its appearance and power of reflection may depend largely upon its setting. So also in the case of the Sabbath the original idea of rest as we tried to outline it above is fundamental in the Mosaic or Jewish Sabbath, but other things have come in and gathered about it that need to be accounted for.

2. Why did this change take place? Was there some imperfection in the original Sabbath on account of which it failed in its intended purpose, so that the new was an improvement upon the old? Or was the change due to a changed condition of man, brought on without any fault of God? The latter was the case. Sin entered God's perfect world and radically changed the state of things, so that God was likewise obliged to change His arrangement with respect to man. This change affected the Sabbath also. The change was not arbitrary on the part of God, but reasonable and pedagogical. As the entire law is a schoolmaster unto Christ, so also the Mosaic statutes concerning the Sabbath were calculated to lead back from the toil and suffering of sin to the true sabbatic rest of the new covenant.

3. *What are the ceremonial features of the Mosaic Sabbath?* Dietrich in his Catechetical Institutions, divides them into three classes: 1. The circumstance of the seventh day. 2. The circumstance that no work must be done. 3. The circumstance that the day shall be sanctified in a peculiar manner.

That the circumstance of the seventh day was ceremonial, typical, transient and not essential to the perpetual

meaning of the Sabbath, appears conclusive from the fact that after Christ had fulfilled the law, this feature of the command was set aside by the Church, evidently under the direction of the Holy Spirit. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the *Sabbath day*; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ" (Col. 2, 16, 17). For the Jew the seventh day had a twofold connection with the past; first, the creation. The seventh day was God's Sabbath after the creative week, and His people were to continue mindful of this fact. Secondly, the day was connected with their deliverance from Egypt. The Egyptian bondage was their week of labor, their deliverance from this bondage and their entrance into the land of Canaan was their Sabbath. Both these grounds were therefore urged by Moses in giving the sabbatic command. The day as the seventh, the Lord's day of rest, had also a connection with the future, viz., that it was a type of that more perfect rest to which they looked forward. For the Jew then the pedagogical importance of the seventh day circumstance was this: "First, that he was thereby constantly reminded of the fact that God was keeping His Sabbath after the creative week, and that man should therefore so contemplate God's beneficence and so live in Him as to make this Sabbath possible for the Lord; secondly, that he, the Jew, should also keep his Sabbath after the endurance of Egyptian bondage by seeking his true peace and rest in God, his Deliverer, and not in the gods of the heathen, nor in the creature world; and, thirdly, that, since his Sabbath in Canaan was not perfect on account of the labor and sorrow of sin prevailing every day of the week, he should look forward to the more perfect Sabbath under the New Dispensation, of which the land of Canaan was but a type.

That the circumstance that no work of any kind should be done on the Sabbath is ceremonial appears already from this that the original idea of sabbatic rest does not consist in mere cessation from labor, but in actively seeking and finding full rest and peace in God. But the cessation of rest as commanded by Moses could take place without participating in this real rest. The former could then at most be only a necessary condition for the latter. The fact, furthermore, that the prohibition covers items which, if this feature of the command is not ceremonial, might, with good reason, be considered trivial, such as not to build fire, not to prepare a meal, not to carry a burden and the like, shows that an ele-

ment is contained here that is nothing else than ceremonial or typical. Then, too, the ceremonial character of this feature of the Mosaic command is especially attested by the fact, as Dietrich well observes, that throughout the New Testament this prohibition is nowhere repeated, and that neither Christ nor His apostles strictly observed it. We may add this also as evidence that the Christian Church, although she has her day of rest, yet, being led by the Spirit of God, she, from the very beginning, did not insist upon this labor prohibition in the spirit of Moses, nor to the same extent, nor with the same inflexible rigor. The purpose of this cessation from labor is thus stated by Kliefeth: "But of course, this resting did not have only the negative moment of resting from labor, but in this external rest Israel pictured to itself the rest in God for which the world was originally made, held before its conscience also the loss of this rest in God and the causes of this loss, pictured to itself the final eternal rest, the final end of redemption, had a fore-taste of this salvation, and possessed in it a pledge of the divine grace looking to the blessed promise of the end. Thus the Sabbath, through its rest was actually a sermon, which also naturally influenced the Israelite: God rested in Israel in that He gave Israel the Sabbath, and Israel rested in God in that it kept the Sabbath." It should be added yet here, that rest from labor was meant to expressly remind Israel of their bondage and labor in Egypt, that they might be grateful for their inherited land, and look to God, the Giver of these blessings.

The third ceremonial element as given by Dietrich, is the manner in which the Jew was obligated to sanctify the Sabbath. This element is partly involved in the preceding, since cessation from all manner of labor was a part and, indeed, it seems, the most important part of the day's required sanctification. But there were also a few statutes of a positive character added; first, that the morning and evening sacrifices were doubled; secondly, that the newly baked shew-bread was placed upon the golden table in place of the old. Then there are all the Mosaic commands, with reference to the manner in which the day should be sanctified. Concerning the first we have spoken above, concerning the other two, without entering upon a discussion of their individual signification, we know that they were ceremonial, since they were but a part of the Mosaic cultus that found its fulfilment in Christ and was consequently done away.

Summing up now the signification of the Sabbath for the Jew we have this: The day was intended to remind him of

that rest for both God and man, in which the creation week issued. But since this rest could not be enjoyed on account of sin having come in, and since the Savior had not yet come to make this rest possible in spite of sin, the Jew was taught by the Sabbath to look forward in hope to the rest of a new dispensation. The Sabbath's connection with Israel's deliverance from Egypt was in general the same: Egypt was a place of servitude, their deliverance was their Sabbath; but their Sabbath was imperfect on account of sin and Canaan was consequently but a type of a better land, hence, again, the Sabbath's pointing forward. Now, since the body had not come, i. e. Christ, with the fulness of the Spirit who, by His gifts and cleansing, puts the Sabbath into our hearts, external means were used, such as ceremonies and types, as well as the word of promise itself, to direct the Israelite to that better Sabbath. Aside from this these external arrangements had a disciplinary purpose, viz., to teach obedience, self-control, self-restraint and the like.

But the Sabbath had another express purpose for the Jew that has not been touched upon yet. In Ex. 31 the Lord says that "the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout this generation for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever." Accordingly the Sabbath was a sign of an everlasting covenant. What was this covenant? Inasmuch as the Lord in this passage refers to the creation week and its consequent Sabbath, the covenant must be this that man's sabbatic rest for which the world was created, though it has been disturbed through sin, shall nevertheless be procured for him in the end, and of this the Sabbath is the pledge or sign. God promises to be true to His part of the promise, but He likewise insists that man shall be true to his part. "My sabbath ye shall keep," is emphatically repeated by the great lawgiver and the prophets. This especially is the evangelical element in the Mosaic Sabbath. It required faith, faith in God's goodness and that He would redeem His promise; faith also in His grace, viz., that He of His own gracious will would do this for them. "Verily my sabbath ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you" (Ex. 31, 13).

Finally, that in the divine regulation of setting apart for rest from ordinary labor one day out of seven a natural exigency is recognized hardly any one will deny. Experi-

ence teaches that both the body and the mind need one day's rest out of seven.

THESIS III.

UNDER THE NEW DISPENSATION THE SABBATH OR THE THIRD COMMANDMENT HAS BEEN RECAST.

Under Moses changes were made about the original Sabbath that it might fit into the cultus of God's chosen people and aid in working out the design for which that people was selected. When that problem now was worked out and Christ was come to fulfill all righteousness, then the Sabbath which was at all times closely interwoven with man's religious condition, was again changed to accord with the new condition, for the Church now no longer lived under the regime of law but of grace.

1. *The distinctly Jewish Sabbath was set aside.* Both the first day of the week was taken instead of the last and also the other Mosaic statutes as cessation from labor, the sacrifices and the like were not carried over to the new. But was this right? Was it God's will? It surely was, for Christ Himself while in the flesh unmistakably indicated both by word and deed that the Jewish Sabbath was passing. Paul too is very explicit on this point, for he classes the Sabbath days with those things that were but a shadow, while the body is of Christ, and that we must allow no one to judge us with respect to such things (Col. 2, 16, 17). Sabbaths, new moons, distinctions between meats and drink and the like are but shadows, but the body, the substance itself, is Christ and He has come. If now the body is here, surely no one should be so foolish as to grasp for the shadow. That would be fatal, for just by grasping after the shadow one loses the body. "Christ is become of none effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5, 4).

In accordance now with these facts the Church has acted. She chose the first day of the week instead of the seventh and omitted from it all the Mosaic statutes concerning work and sacrifices, and she declares that the day is sanctified not by the observance of external rites or legal enactments, but by spiritual fellowship with God through His Word. Of course if any one chose besides to observe the Jewish Sabbath or at least some of its regulations, the Church offered no objection, provided it was done as a matter of personal free choice and not as of any legal obli-

gation. There however always were some and always will be some who differ from this position; indeed, in general there are two schools of thought among Christians on this subject the one, as the Lutheran Church, holding the above purely evangelical view, the other, as the Reformed churches, defending a more legalistic conception. The Lutheran Church has also on this point spoken with no uncertain sound in her confessions. "They that think the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. The Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaic ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath." Augs. Conf., Art. XXVIII. Again in the same article we read, "There are certain marvellous disputationes touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sabbath: which all arose from the false persuasion, that there should be a service in the Church, like to the Levitical; and that Christ committed to the apostles and bishops, the devising new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church, when the righteousness of faith was not plainly enough taught. Some dispute, that the observation of the Lord's day is not indeed of the law of God, but *as it were [quasi]* of the law of God: and touching holy days they prescribe how far it is lawful to work in them. What else are such disputationes but snares for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate tradition, yet the equity of them can never be perceived, so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth; which must needs remain where the righteousness of faith, and Christian liberty are not known."

Another point should be touched upon here before going farther, viz., who made this change? Did the Lord do it or did the Church do it? Several points are really involved. First, with reference to the abrogation of the old, no one could do that but the Lord. The Church at no time had or has the right to set aside a divine ordinance, not even a purely ceremonial one. Christ Himself set those things aside, when by His redemptive work He had fulfilled them. Or it might be said that Christ did not actually set them aside, but that they simply fell away as the darkness disappears when the sun rises. But the more difficult point is in regard to the fixing of the first day. Did the Lord do this or did the Church, i. e. human authority, do this? In ordinary language we say that the Church chose the first day of the week as the Christian's

day of rest. This is correct too, if we understand that the Church was directed in this choice by the Holy Spirit. The expression is often made that the Church might have chosen another day of the week as well as the first, or that she might even yet make such a change. I think we may fairly question such statements. If there is any day of which we can say in a special sense, "This is the day which the *Lord* hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it" (Ps. 118, 24), that day is the one upon which the Lord arose. By that act God made the first day of the week "the Lord's day" in a peculiar sense, and He saw to it also that it became the Church's day of rest. Nor did this come in conflict with the apostle's statement that the days are all alike (Rom. 14, 5), for whatever difference may be affirmed is not a difference in the day itself, but in that which God was pleased to do upon that day. Nor does such a position render the third commandment legalistic as though the Lord anew has bound us to the observance of a certain day. It is not the day but rather the event of the day that is commemorated. Besides, since the Church for the sake of order and edification needs some day for her religious assemblies, it is pleasing to the Lord that this be done on the day of Christ's resurrection. Villmar says on this point, "The conception that looks upon Sunday as an arbitrary enactment of the Church is false, and that rest from labor is required simply that there may be time for worship is not sufficient." Likewise Wüttke says that Sunday is not an arbitrary enactment of the Church. Sartorius holds the same view, going even so far as to say that the Church's day of rest must be of divine establishment. *Alt- und neutestamentlicher Cultus*, p. 159. Kliefoth agrees with him.

2. *We still have a Sabbath.* This point was partly discussed already in the foregoing, for it was pointed out that the first day of the week has become our day of rest. But only the matter of the first day as over against the last day of the week was spoken of. The question here is, What is this day to us? We have a Sabbath, what is its nature? That it is not legal was pointed out above. We are under no obligation by divine law and can be under no obligation by human law to keep holy the first day of the week. If the first day of the week as the Church's day of rest is of divine origin, it is only in the sense that that which the Church for the sake of order and edification was bound to do, viz., come together for public worship, should by the guidance of the Holy Spirit take place freely, not by constraint, on the first day of the week in honor to the

risen Lord. But if the day itself is not of divine legal obligation, then there can be no legally obligated service, not even a religious service, no work and no cessation from work, that is not equally binding upon any other day. The day as such has nothing over any other day of the week. What is done on Sunday ought to be done on every other day, and what may be done on other days may likewise be done on Sunday. That too is the sense of our confessions. The Augustana relegates all questions about the Lord's day as of quasi divine enactment and that only to a certain extent may work be done thereon, — relegates them all to the sphere of disputations that only ensnare men's consciences. Hence too Luther in his explanation of the third commandment in the Smaller Catechism says nothing about the day, but speaks only of that which should be done in order that this or any other day may be properly sanctified. Also in his Larger Catechism he says, "This commandment, therefore, according to its gross sense, does not pertain to us Christians; for it is altogether an external matter, like the other ordinances of the Old Testament, which were bound to particular customs, times and places, and all of which have now been made free through Christ." Under the New Dispensation every day is a Sabbath, indeed, the period of the New Dispensation is really the world's great Sabbath. It was introduced already at the creation, for God rested on the seventh day, but the day was disturbed through sin and could not be reestablished until Christ came and broke the power of sin and the devil. Now the Church enjoys this Sabbath every day of her existence upon earth and it shall issue in the still greater Sabbath beyond. Yet these things being true does not say that we have no particular day of rest, or that we are not bound to observe the day that exists as day of rest in the Church. Though there is no divine legal enactment binding us to this day, yet we do it freely through the Spirit and that is the only kind of service that is acceptable. We have a Sabbath, it is the Lord's day, and to it belong all those things that are essential to the sanctification of the holy day.

3. *The Lord's day is sanctified by holy service.* Luther asks, What is meant by keeping the day holy? Answer: "Nothing else than to be occupied in holy words, works and life. For the day needs no sanctification for itself; for in itself it has been created holy. But God desires it to be holy to thee. Therefore it becomes holy or unholy on thy account, according as thou art occupied on the same with things that are holy or unholy." First, then, the day

is not kept by simply abstaining from ordinary labor. Even if we should affirm that the essential feature of the Lord's day is the same as that of the original Sabbath, viz., rest, yet the essential feature of that rest is resting in God, communion and fellowship with God, and that is likewise the chief end of our day of rest. But such resting in God does not consist in mere bodily passivity, but in a certain activity of our souls. What then is the chief thing in this holy service of the Lord's day? "We should fear and love God, that we may not despise preaching and His Word; but hold it sacred, and gladly hear and learn it." Or as Luther says in his Larger Catechism, "Not that [with folded hands] we sit behind the stove and do no rough [external] work, or deck ourselves with a garland and put on our best clothes, but that we occupy ourselves with God's Word, and exercise ourselves therein." In this way we can serve God best, serve ourselves and others best, and come nearest realizing our true rest in God. Furthermore the day is sanctified by other holy works such as visiting the sick, helping the poor, comforting the downcast, for next to hearing and learning God's Word and bringing it to others, there is in the sight of God no more acceptable work than to be of service to the poor, the sick, the unfortunate and the like. Of course these things must be done not from a merely humanitarian motive, but from love and service to God (Matt. 25, 34-36).. Nor are these things to be deferred from a week day until Sunday, simply for gaining more time for ordinary labor, especially if by so doing one deprives himself of the service of God's house or learning God's Word at home.

4. *Works of necessity are allowable.* When we here speak of certain works as allowable on the Lord's day and of others as not allowable, we are viewing the Lord's day as an arrangement in the Church for the sake of order and edification and upon which arrangement we must not needlessly infringe by following ordinary occupations. By works of necessity we mean works of one's ordinary calling or neighborly acts which need to be done on the Lord's day in order that we ourselves or others may not suffer harm in body or property. Thus it is lawful on the Lord's day for a fire department to put out a fire, for a physician to practice medicine, for a farmer to feed his stock or drive his cattle out of the corn field, and the like work. On the other hand I see no necessity for railroads to run trains on Sunday, whether freight or passenger, nor their shops, nor for unlimited mail, telegraph and telephone service. I see no necessity either for factories of various kinds running on

Sundays. There may be some that on account of the great loss that would be sustained by closing down on Sunday, not however because of the day's work, but because of the peculiar nature of the factory, might perhaps be properly classed under works of necessity. But in far the most cases of Sunday work the moving principle is not necessity but greed. In regard to this whole question I would say that worldliness and materialism is being literally ground into the people of this and some other countries by the pernicious system of supposed necessary Sunday work on the part of the government, corporations and individuals.

5. *The Lord's day is profaned*: 1) By teaching or hearing false doctrine or engaging in any false religious service. If the day is especially sanctified by hearing and learning God's Word, then to teach or to hear what is contrary to that Word is surely profaning that day.

2) By neglecting God's Word, either through engaging in unnecessary labor or in amusement or recreation, or through mere indifference or laziness. Here are to be mentioned especially excursions, outings, visiting, reading newspapers.

3) In general by anything that is calculated to draw the mind away from God and His holy Word.

THESIS IV.

TRANSGRESSION OF THE SABBATH BRINGS DEATH.

Under the Old Covenant the Sabbath breaker was put to death (Num. 15, 32). But the Mosaic Sabbath has been put away and hence the corporal penalty no longer applies. Yet essentially the threat still stands and is also executed. We are saved through hearing, learning and obeying God's Word. By neglecting or despising this Word the Lord's day is profaned, and by doing this the perpetrator brings upon himself eternal death, for the wrath of God abideth on him.

JOSEPH RABBINOWITZ.

BY REV. PAUL S. L. JANOWITZ, A. B., COLUMBUS, O.

"Blindness in part hath happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." Yea, such a darkness envelopes them, and such a blindness curses them that they cannot see the Light of the world as He shines on them with resplendent brightness. It is true that they had the starlight of Moses and the moonlight of the Prophets. But even these obscure lights were to them darkened; because they looked at them through the murky glasses of tradition, formality and self-righteousness. No wonder, therefore, when the Sun of Righteousness, from whom Moses and the Prophets derive and reflect their light, arose, in all the brightness of His glory, that their enfeebled vision was blinded. This darkness remains over Israel, until this day, only lit up now and then by some star that has caught some of the rays of the light of the world. Over Israel's dark night of national rejection and hardening, some stars of the first magnitude have arisen, giving assurance that the Sun of Righteousness was yet for Israel, and prophesying that He would yet rise on them with His full splendor.

Among such great lights the names of Philippi, Caspari, Neander and Edersheim shine among the brightest. But these lights pale in the presence of that greater light, Rabbinowitz, who, since the conversion of St. Paul, is the most important accession to Christianity from Judaism.

The story of his life and work is so full of encouragement for the lovers of Israel; so full of lessons for the believer in Christ; so full of arguments against the enemies of Jewish mission work; and so full of instruction for laborers in the Lord's vineyard, that a study of them will not but profit us all.

About sixty years ago in Kishenew, Russia, a little boy was born to a Jewish family, Rabbinowitz by name, who gave him the name of Joseph. Joy filled the hearts of the parents, for God had granted their prayer in giving them a son, who could after their death pray for them the Kadash, i. e., the prayer for the repose of the soul, only to be offered by a male relative. Jewish parents long ardently for male children, especially that they may pray for the peace of the departed. And when a parent faces death without the hope of male issue, sadness deep and intense fills his heart. We

need hardly wonder then at the joy of the Rabbinowitz family at the advent of Joe.

According to the law he was circumcised on the eighth day of his life. The rite of circumcision cannot be administered except in the presence of ten males, who have been confirmed (Bar Mitzwa, i. e., Son of the Commandment); nor can Kadish be said, nor any public service be held without ten confirmed males present. A glad festival was celebrated in the Rabbinowitz family in honor of the circumcision of Joe; and friends and relatives flocked to their home to offer congratulations to the parents, to pray for the prosperity of the infant, and to help along the glad festivity.

Owing to the scarcity of materials not so much can be said of the early life of Joseph in the way of pleasing anecdote; yet we know enough of him to examine the influences that were brought to bear on him, and that made him what he was. His early training was that of a strict orthodox Jewish home. The ceremonies and traditions of Israel were diligently inculcated. Fear of God, reverence for the law and the synagogue, respect for parents and teachers, love for his people and her history, zeal in studies, sweetness of disposition, hatred for oppression and sympathy for the oppressed were traits of his character that made him admired even as a boy. The poetic stories of Israel's lore found in the Talmud, or told him by parents and teachers, fired his youthful imagination. The piety of a Jewish home with loving parents made him a pious boy and man. The rabbi taught him Hebrew that he might read the Old Testament and the prayers of the Synagogue. The droll cheder, i. e., Jewish school, with its dry repetitions and mummeries, was nevertheless a pleasure to him. There he learned to kiss the sacred letters of the Hebrew alphabet, careful that they should suffer no indignity. There, also he learned the principles of his religion.

With delight did he hail the glad festivals of Israel. The weekly Sabbath directed his attention to soul rest, and he fervently, though self-righteously, sought Jehovah's presence in the synagogue. Here, with the whole congregation, he piously heard the reading of Moses, the Prophets and the Sacred Writings. Here he fervently joined in the loud Amens. Here his voice mingled with the voices of the others in the responses. The drosh, i. e., sermon, held either by the rabbi or the traveling preacher, engrossed his attention. With the keenest joy he took part in the cele-

bration of the Passover. For the glory of God the Jew eats as much as possible at this feast; and the story has been told of Joe that he ate so much that a button, unable to stand the strain due to his having eaten so much, flew from his coat to the other side of the table, where it hit a brother in the face! But it was all done for the glory of God, and the little fellow was praised! Pentecost caused him joy, for then his soul contemplated the law, the great law, the meditation of the people of Israel. New Year's he approached with joy and trembling, glad for the holiday, yet fearful that his death might be fixed for the coming year. On the great day of atonement, the white fast of the Jewish calendar, he afflicted his soul with grief and his body with fasting, beseeching the mercy of God to forgive, and not write his name in the book of death. His little eyes danced with delight when the feast of tabernacles brought its booths with fruit hung in various places; he knew that when the feast was over, according to the custom, a large share would fall to his lot.

Simchas Torah, i. e. Rejoicing for the Law, was indeed a joy to him. His soul was filled with rapture. As the rabbi with rejoicing and singing, heading the procession with the Torah, i. e., scroll of the Law, in his arms, marched through the aisles of the synagogue, young Joe would join the procession, dancing, singing, laughing, joking, throwing corn at the rabbi and other dignitaries of the synagogue, just as the other boys did to show their great joy for Jehovah's giving them the Law. Perhaps he enjoyed Purim best of all. For then he could go from house to house in full masquerade dress, making fun, and by his peculiar antics mystifying the people who tried in vain to find out who the young performer was. Having performed his part well, he was loaded with fruits, candy and other good things that the people had in store for the masqueraders. Surely, as a boy, he loved his religion. No doubt one reason why the Jews cling so closely to their religion is the joy of their many festivals.

But these things belong to the periphery of the Jewish religion; they are merely some of its outward forms. After all the substance of his religious training was the dead orthodoxy of the Talmud. His lessons in the cheder were mechanical; his prayers at first were entirely unintelligible, the many ceremonies that confronted him at every turn could not but make a formal man of him. He was taught the doctrines and duties of Israel with a strap beside him

in the hands of a teacher, who by no means believed in spoiling the child in sparing the rod; but who would rather have spoiled the rod than spare the child. His little friends would scold him at the least deviation from the countless laws of the rabbis. Yet he progressed much and won the esteem of all who knew him.

Just before he was thirteen he was prepared for confirmation. He was to read his *maphter*, i. e., portion before the assembled congregation, and thus be admitted into the congregation of Israel. His soul was prepared for this event with all the care of watchful parents, diligent teachers and pious self-examinations. He was taught to believe that until he was Barmitzva (confirmed) all his sins rested upon his father; but that as soon as he was confirmed, the responsibility for his acts rested upon him. How this weighs on the mind of a pious Jewish boy, only he knows who has experienced it. Before he was confirmed the doctrines and duties of his religion were explained to him in detail. He learned the ten articles of the Jewish faith and believed in them heartily. And when the day of his confirmation came, the day on which he became a *man*, a full member of the congregation of Israel, his soul was filled with mingled feelings of joy and sorrow. His parents rejoiced on raising such a son. His teachers were proud of him. And as his sweet voice solemnly and trustfully chanted his Maphter, the eyes of many in the congregation were filled with tears. At the feast given in honor of his confirmation he was congratulated by his co-religionists. But nobody rejoiced more than his parents, whose hearts beat with just pride for their gifted son.

Before finishing the account of his early training, which was chiefly religious, it would be well to consider briefly what he thought of Christ. Nobody but an orthodox Jew knows how much orthodox Jews hate Jesus. Next to Satan He is the sinner *par excellens*. The infamous lies which the rabbis have invented about Christ were told him. And he believed them, and an intense hatred for Christ and Christianity filled his mind and heart. These lies about Jesus' birth are too vile to be mentioned here. In answer to them let it be said that during His lifetime Jesus never was considered an illegitimate child. Moses forbade that those who were illegitimately born or their descendants, until the tenth generation, be allowed to enter the congregation of the Lord. If Christ was not legitimately born, why was he allowed to mingle with the people as one of them? Why

was he allowed to preach in synagogues and even in the temple? No! he never was considered to be of illegitimate birth during his life; and indeed, not until long after Luke's Gospel was written; the Talmudists made capital of Luke's account of Jesus' birth; hence the vile lies that every orthodox Jew believes about Christ. Of course, Rabbinowitz believed these. The foolish story purporting to give the way in which Jesus is said to have found out that he was an illegitimate child; the puerile account of Jesus' stealing the ineffable name, and the ridiculous use to which he put the power that the possession of this name gave him; the gruesome figment of Christ's collecting wood in hell, for the purpose of burning himself three times a day—were eagerly listened to and believed in by him. He would spit at the mention of Jesus' name; he would cover his eyes were a picture of Christ or a cross in sight. He cursed Jesus. He blasphemously told the lies that he heard about Christ. Words cannot express the hatred that an orthodox Jew feels toward Christ. Hatred of Jesus has become an article of Jewish belief. It becomes flesh and blood to the orthodox Jews to hate Christ. Need we wonder that young Rabbinowitz, like his brethren, hated Christ?

Such are some of the leading characteristics of the boyhood training of Rabbinowitz.

After his confirmation he continued with his studies. He began then to study in good earnestness the Talmud and the later Jewish literature, whose wisdom and foolishness he mastered. His quick reasoning powers, brilliant imagination and retentive memory put him head and shoulders above his schoolmates. He was wise beyond his years, and his knowledge and grasp of his studies were admired and respected by those much older than himself. He was the pride of his teachers, the joy of his parents; but as is generally the case the envy of his schoolmates, whom he excelled. Nor was his knowledge simply that of the head. In spite of the formalism of orthodox Judaism, his heart was touched and glowed with a piety and sweetness rare in one outside of Christ.

On arriving at the suitable age he took up the study of law; and with the same diligence, ability and thoroughness that he exhibited in the study of the Talmud, he mastered its intricacies; and became the leading lawyer at the bar at Kishenew. He was not an advocate of the kind of which we so often hear. He never took the case of a guilty man and defended him as innocent, if he knew that his client

were guilty. The poor and oppressed found in him a ready helper and counsel; and when they were unable to pay for his services, they were willingly helped for nothing. His untiring diligence in preparing his cases, his deep penetration into the questions at issue, his genial manner of meeting an opposing lawyer, his burning eloquence, his brilliant wit and repartee, two qualities not generally found in Israelites, his high moral character and weight of personality, combined in making him an advocate of high order. His fellow lawyers never coveted the opportunity of meeting him in debate and as far as the writer has been able to find out, he never lost a case. This is remarkable when we consider that he defended many Jews; and how the Russians feel toward the Jews is well known.

As a literary man he did not have his equal among the Jews of Russia. His writings, both in prose and poetry, were eagerly read and gladly spread by his people. The purity of his diction, the clearness of his thought, the brilliance and cadence in the structure of his sentences, the vigor of his style, the progress of the thought, often ending in the most startling climaxes, the wonderful flower garden of pleasing images, made him a rare literary man among his people. And when the most prominent Jewish journals, through his conversion, lost him as a contributor, their circulation decreased.

As a reformer and lover of his people he became famous and deserves our highest praise. He tried to resurrect the corpse of the rabbithood. In 1882 he published a plan for the reformation of the rabbithood, a plan which for the state of the Russian Jews was somewhat ideal, and therefore failed of acceptance. But had it been offered to the American, French, English or German Jews, it would probably have been adopted. As philanthropist he was more successful than as reformer. In no country is the Jew more oppressed than in Russia. The hatred of the people, the bigotry of the Greek priesthood, the cupidity of office-holders unite in making his life miserable; and with the exception of Spain, Russia has excelled all other nations in the barbarity of the persecutions that have been poured on the Jew. What the Cossacks did is a matter of ages past. But the banishments and confiscations that he suffered at the hands of the last Czar are fresh in the memory of many who will read this. The philanthropic soul of Rabbinowitz shone forth in all her splendor in this last persecution. He gave himself up night and day to ameliorate the wretched condition of his oppressed people. His time, strength, money and learning

were freely offered on the bleeding altar of his down-trodden nation. It was while engaged in this work of mercy in behalf of his people that he was converted.

In works like these Rabbinowitz spent his early manhood and prime. He showed that he was a man of extraordinary gifts of mind and heart. He had a love for the good that the natural man under moral training has, and strove to be useful to his fellowmen in his own way and after his own light. But God had better things in store for him than the natural good as the natural man sees it. He who would do his fellowmen real good must be good, i. e., be regenerated, and that is done by God's regenerating grace alone. By the grace of God Rabbinowitz, in a peculiar manner, received the highest good, i. e., Christ; and having this highest Good, spent the rest of his life in the work of bringing this highest Good to his people, thus becoming a philanthropist indeed.

Early in the eighties, Alexander III banished a great many Jews from Russia. These poor exiles suffered untold hardships. Their pitiable condition appealed strongly to the sympathetic soul of Rabbinowitz, who bought farms for many of them in Bessarabia, a province of southeastern Russia. Not being able to supply freely the wants of his distressed people in this way, he decided to go to Palestine and see whether he could not make provisions for a number of colonies of Russian exiles. When about ready to start for the Holy Land a New Testament in Hebrew was handed to him with the remark that he would find it an excellent guide book for Palestine. He carelessly put the Testament in a pocket, little thinking that it would become a guide-book in a sense undreamt of by him. The Holy Land was a disappointment to him. The beautiful forms in which his fiery imagination was wont to clothe the Holy Land vanished from his mind before the barren reality of the land that ages ago flowed with milk and honey. Soulsick at the dreary sight, he came to Jerusalem, the city which this Hebrew of Hebrews painted in most romantic colors. His disappointment at the sight of the Holy City tramped under the foot of the uncircumcised, threw him into the most perplexing trains of thought. One day while sitting on the brow of Mt. Olivet, half dreaming, half awake, musing on the strange history of the chosen people, wondering why Jehovah had driven them out of their city and land and had made them a "by-word" among the nations, he turned his half-closed eye toward the reputed spot of Calvary. In an instant, as by a flash, his doubts gave way

to certainty. Springing to his feet he shouted aloud : "The kingdom of Palestine is in the hands of Brother Jesus." All his doubts had vanished, and his darkened mind was filled with a radiance surpassing the sun in its mid-day splendor. Reaching for the Testament, which had lain unused in his pocket, since he received it, he opened it, and his eyes fell on the words: "I am the vine; ye are the branches. . . . Without Me ye can do nothing." Ah! those words contained in an epitome the reason for Israel's sad rejection and persecution. Rabinowitz read and believed. He looked with terrible pain on Him whom he had pierced, and mourned for Him as one mourneth for his only son. He mixed faith with that repentance and arose from his knees a justified child of the New Covenant.

But why remain in Palestine after finding out the cause of Israel's rejections? Why not return to Kishenew and tell his people; so that with him they might have "the key to the kingdom of Palestine?" He must return without delay! So return he did. But he did not find the people so willing to receive, as he was to give, this key. The sensation produced by Rabinowitz preaching Christ at Kishenew is simply indescribable. Sticks, stones, eggs and filth vied with one another in the rapidity and continuity with which they were hurled at him. Slanderous lies and dire persecutions were heaped upon him. Those of his own household turned against him and would hold no communications with him. But he remained firm, telling the Jews whom he could reach of "Brother Jesus." One by one he won the members of his family; a great number of relatives, friends and strangers were won for Christ by this unique apostle of the nineteenth century. In a surprising manner the Russian government, reversing in his favor some laws of long standing, gave him permission to preach and build a church.

It is surely a marvel of grace to see a Hebrew of Hebrews preaching in the Hebrew language to a Hebrew congregation. This state of affairs existed in Kishenew until Rabinowitz died last May. He was a born orator, and what God bestowed by nature he polished and shaped by careful study and practice; but it was only when grace wrought that this truly gifted man appeared at his best. With his conversion he brought all his gifts of learning, eloquence and wealth to the feet of Jesus for consecrated service; and by the results Christ has shown that He received and used these consecrated gifts. His eloquence is at times

like the young mountain stream driven mad with torrents of rain and washing away everything with its resistless force, in its wild rush to the plain; at times it is like the joyous rivulet making green and fruitful the field through which it passes; at times it is like the great calm ocean, lit up by the setting sun, carrying on its mighty bosom shiploads of people with utmost serenity. He does not preach intricate theories which require the keenest powers of bright minds to grasp; but clothes the sublime truths of the Gospel in simple pictures. He knew what every rabbi knows, but what many ministers affect to despise, though Christ sanctioned it by his example, the utility and desirability of illustrating the great truths of Christianity by pictures taken from objects familiar to the popular heart and mind. The contents of his sermons are purely evangelical, adapted to a Jewish congregation. He recognizes no foundation other than that of Prophets and Apostles, Jesus being the Chief Cornerstone. His deep insight into the Law and Gospel, his familiar knowledge of all questions at controversy between the Church and Synagogue, his apt power of quoting the Messianic prophecies, and showing their fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth, and his absolute subjection of his reason to a "Thus saith the Lord," and his ability of enforcing this on others, show that the word of God is the sun from which he derives all his light, heat and strength.

Such preaching as this is all conquering. Need we wonder that God made him such a blessing to his people? The conversion of such a prominent man in itself must cause inquiry; and the confidence of those who had experienced his kindness moved them to study the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship. He reached a great many people. His house of prayer was filled to overflowing every Saturday, when his followers gathered to worship God in Jesus' name, and to hear Rabbinowitz preach. The people who were reached by this man can be roughly divided into two classes, those who came in contact personally with him, and those who, not hearing him, read his writings. This latter class is by far the larger. Thousands of Russian Jews either individually or in small congregations, read his many sermons and tracts the better to learn of "Jesus, their Brother." It is said that several thousand Jews have, through his writings, been led to believe in the Messianic claims of Jesus.

For a number of years the need of a church to accommodate the large audience of believers that Sabbath after

Sabbath came together, made itself felt in a way that plans were devised to build a church. Permission having been received from the Russian government, and the money having been contributed by friends in England thereto, a beautiful stone church, the house of prayer, was built. Of this event Rabbinowitz writes: "God gave me grace to build a beautiful house to the praise of His name publicly before the children of my people." And how beautiful is the superscription in Hebrew and Russian: "Let all the house of Israel, therefore, know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus, whom ye have crucified," as it glitters with its gilded letters from the walls of the house, drawing the children of Israel to God through Jesus. Since December 27, 1890 (the time of the dedication of the church) a new epoch began in the progress of my work. Sabbath after Sabbath the house of prayer is filled to overflowing with men, women and children, who come to hear the Gospel of God's kingdom, and to pour out their prayers before their Heavenly Father in Jesus' name. In addition to this each Tuesday evening very many come to study in the Scriptures the meaning of those words that testify of "Jesus, the Messiah."

Shortly after Rabbinowitz was converted he published some propositions and theses, which may be termed the confessions of the movement at whose head he stood. Prof. Franz Delitzsch translated these into German, and they found many eager readers. Dr. Schodde translated part of Delitzsch's work into English, and published his translation in the *Missionary Review* some years ago. The writer will quote from the translation of Dr. Schodde. It will be noticed that this confession is not only theological, but also sociological, inasmuch as Rabbinowitz sought to better the sociological status of his people also. In the first five theses he reviewed the sad state of the Jews in the East and proceeds with the sixth as follows:

"6. The material condition of the Jews cannot in any way be improved, unless their morals and spiritual status has first been bettered.

"7. In order to elevate the people morally there is need of a deep-seated regeneration, of a spiritual renewal. We must cast aside our false gods—namely, our love of money, as such, and fear of evil, as such.

"8. In order to renew our inmost being and to aid us to love the truth and to hate the evil, we stand in need of a helper, of a reliable and experienced man, of a physician,

whose personality and medicine have already stood the test of experience.

"9. Such a helper we must seek among the descendants of Jacob and must select a man who loves Israel; one who has given up His life for the sanctification of the divine name, and for the sanctification of the Torah (law) and of the Prophets; a man who has become known to all the inhabitants of the globe, on account of the purity of His clean soul, and His strong love for His people, the children of Israel; a man who has lived in a time when Israel had already accepted the traditional law, and had already taken its place among the nations of the earth; a man who on the one side had thoroughly recognized the haughtiness of heart in his Jewish brethren, as they boasted of their noble descent from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, their fathers, blessed of the Eternal God, and who were proud of their wisdom that had been given them in the Torah received on Mt. Sinai; and who, on the other hand, saw through their stubbornness and their prosperity in good and prosperous days, to forsake the living God, their heavenly Father, and to choose new gods for themselves, such as the love of money and the supremacy over their brethren through science and Mammon.

"10. The man who unites all this in himself, after a careful search in the old books of the history of our people, the children of Israel, we have found in the one Jesus of Nazareth, who was slain at Jerusalem before the destruction of our last temple.

"11. The wise men among His contemporaries were not able yet to understand His teachings, nor the blessed purposes of His work, which He sought to perform for His Jewish brethren—namely, this, that He sought to lay stress upon the observance of the prescriptions of the law pertaining to the heart and the head, and not on the minutiae of outward acts and deeds, which are set to be changed according to the time, place and political condition of the Jews. We, however, who are living in the year 5644 (by Jewish calendar) can say with a certainty that He, Jesus, sought only the welfare of His brethren and offered peace to their whole race.

"12. Therefore, the strength of our love for our Israelitic brethren impels us to hold in reverence the name of Jesus, our Brother. We should learn to appreciate His holy words spoken in love and truth, as they are found written in the Gospels, and should impress these truths on our children in the schools, should speak of them constantly.

in the society of others, should receive the Gospel books as blessings into our houses, and should unite them with all the sacred books which have been left to us as a blessing from our really wise men in all generations.

"13. We hope confidently that the words of our Brother Jesus, which were spoken afores times to our Israelitic brethren in righteousness, love and pity, will find root in our hearts and bring forth the fruits of righteousness and salvation. These will change our hearts and make them love the true and the good, and then, too, the hearts of the people and the governments will turn toward us in kindness, to give us continuance and a position among the other nations which live in safety under the shadow of the laws of Europe, which have been given and written in the spirit of our Brother, who has given up His life to make the world happy, and to remove evil from the earth. Amen."

So far the theses setting forth the purpose of the movement. The doctrinal basis of this movement is set forth in ten propositions. "The first eight are a historico-dogmatical statement, based on the Old Testament, of the promised Messiah and the fate of Israel." The ninth and tenth will be quoted here:

"9. The word of the Lord spoken to Abraham our father; to Moses, our Prophet; to David, our king; and to his servants, the true prophets, has found its fulfilment and realization about seventy years before the destruction of our second temple; for the Lord has taken pity on His people, and has exalted the house of our salvation in the house of David, His servant, and has caused to shoot forth for us a righteous branch — namely, the Lord Jesus, the Christ who has come forth for us out of Bethlehem, the city of David, to be the ruler of Israel — He who is the exalted Son of the Most High, to whom His Father has given the throne of David. He it is who rules over the house of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there is no end; He has suffered and has been crucified, and has been buried, and has risen again from the dead, and now lives, and behold He sits at the right hand of our Father in heaven.

"10. According to the decree of the impenetrable wisdom of God, our fathers were struck with hardness of heart, and the Lord has afflicted them with a spiritual sleep, so that they resisted Christ, and sinned against Him from that day to our own, in order to stimulate other nations all the more to zeal, and to contribute to the reconciliation of the world since these people learned to have faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God and David, Our King, when they

heard His messengers of peace (Is. 52, 7), who had been cast from Israel in disgrace. But now since in consequence of our sins against the Christ of God, the world has become rich in faith in this Christ, and in consequence of our unbelief the times of the Gentiles have been fulfilled (Luke 21, 24), and these have entered into the kingdom of God in their entirety, the time of our entrance has also come; so that we, the descendants of Abraham, become blessed through our faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that the God of our Fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, may again have mercy on us, and again may plant the torn-out branches into our holy roots, i. e. into Christ, and that in this way all Israel may partake of eternal salvation, and our holy city Jerusalem, may be built again, and the throne of David may again be established forever and ever. Amen."

Rabbinowitz, since the publication of his Theses and Propositions, published another confession of the faith of his followers, but it contains no prominent ideas not mentioned in the Theses and Propositions. It is an amplification of them. A detailed account of the faith of Rabbinowitz can be found in his autobiography and numerous published sermons and tracts many of which have been translated into English and German.

Naturally the crusade of Rabbinowitz will be judged in different ways, and will receive opposition, qualified approval, or unlimited praise. That Jews oppose it is the most natural thing in the world; but sad to say some Christians give it their unqualified condemnation. The leaders of the Jews attack Rabbinowitz in the most rancorous way in the same periodicals for which before his conversion he was the most popular contributor. Looking at everything from the standpoint of dollars and cents, and judging others by themselves, they at first claimed that his conversion was due to gold; but his giving up his large practice at the bar, and his helping his people even more than before his conversion were unanswerable refutations of this attack. Then these *loving* men who proceeded from the principle that a truly converted Jew is an impossibility, prophesied that after experiencing the attacks of the Jew and the suspicion of the Christian for a time he would return to the Synagogue; his death gave the lie to this prophecy; for he died a Christian. Finally they claimed that he was insane and that his work would go to pieces, just as their forefathers claimed that the apostles were full of new wine; but his great success, many publications, immense influence and especially forbearance toward his slanderers si-

lenced this sour grape story. Had Rabbinowitz become an atheist or blasphemer, these men would have looked doubtful, shrugged their shoulders, and murmured something about his being earnest, though wrong, and that he should therefore be respected; but to have become a Christian — ah, that is the unpardonable crime!

Many Christians have opposed this movement because Rabbinowitz has retained many of the practices of the Jewish nation, though he observes these from altogether different motives from those that the rabbis give for their observance. To judge this movement aright its circumstances and causes must be taken into consideration. It is a movement of and for Jews who wish to keep their nationality intact as far as this can be done consistently with the New Testament. This principle has moved them to retain the observance of much of the ceremonial law, notably of circumcision and the seventh day, without however regarding these things necessary to salvation, or condemning those who do otherwise. Rabbinowitz proceeds on the principle that a German in accepting Christianity *must* not cease being a German; he is to be a German Christian, observing all the marks of a patriotic German as long as such marks are consistent with Christianity. So a Jew, who is converted to Christ, is not to cease being a Jew. When asked by Pastor Faltin, the Lutheran missionary to the Jews at Kishenew, whether a converted Jew who would not observe these things sinned, Rabbinowitz promptly answered "no; but his conduct will seriously impair his influence over his Jewish brethren, if he attempts to win them for Christ." This position is certainly biblical. Like Paul in matters of indifference, he made himself all things to all men, if by all means he might gain some. To the Jew he went as a Jew that he might gain the Jew. The Jewish Christians of the apostolic days certainly observed the ceremonial law, not however as necessary for salvation, but for a wise patriotism. Paul who would not circumcise Titus, a Gentile, did circumcise Timothy, a half Jew, that the latter might work under less obstacles among the Jews. Paul, who would not allow the Gentile Christians to observe the ceremonial law, kept the Jewish festivals, kept his Nazarite vow, and at the time of his arrest in the temple he was engaged in the act of purifying himself and paying a sum of money for the purification of four Christian Nazarites who were unable to pay for themselves. And this Paul did at the suggestion of Peter, James and some of the other apostles who advised this act to show that he did not consider it wrong in itself to take

part in the ceremonial laws of the temple. And when Rabbinowitz held that "in Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature;" and — that he might the better reach his people and not that it is necessary for salvation, he yet observed the ceremonial law, we should honor him for the noble use to which he put his Christian liberty. Though not able to agree with everything in this movement, — and with what movement do we so agree? — perhaps our judgment of it can be best expressed in the words of the sainted Delitsch: "Destroy it not; it contains a blessing! May God keep it in right channels!"

Such was Rabbinowitz the Jew and the Christian. In utmost harmony he united in his person the most diverse qualities, each shining with a luster sufficient to make him famous. He was a poet and a theologian, a preacher and a pastor, a lawyer and evangelist, a Jew and a Christian, a talmudical and biblical scholar, a mystic and a man of affairs, a destroyer and a reconstructor, a philanthropist and a literary man; and in all of these capacities he was great. Back of all his gifts, as the soil from which he drew their excellencies, were his ardent piety, consecration and selflessness, and back of these his unswerving faith in the Messiahship of Jesus and utter dependence on the Holy Spirit for power.

And now Rabbinowitz is dead; the great Rabbinowitz is dead! Last May the lamp of earthly light went out in the presence of the lamp of heavenly light. His sickness was very brief, lasting but a few days; and up to the very end he was busy preaching, lecturing, writing, translating and planning for the spread of God's kingdom among the Jews. The permission of the Czar for him to ride gratis a "gospel coach" attached to any train on Russian railroads, that he might the better reach the Jews, having been received, friends in Scotland were building a gospel coach for him. But God willed that His faithful servant ride home in the chariot of heaven, rather than through Russia in his gospel coach. Nor was he permitted to finish his part of the translation of the New Testament into the Jargon, for which work he had been chosen as chief translator by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Like the giant and herculean oak that dies before its full usefulness is at an end, the great and mighty Rabbinowitz, as it seems to human wisdom, died before he had finished his work. Yet the Lord knows better than we. He gave the great worker; He took the great worker; blessed be the name of the Lord!

His position among Jewish converts is unique. Like a high mountain whose snowy head pierces the heavens high above the surrounding mountains, and whose height and grandeur attracts and engrosses attention to itself, Rabbinowitz, the greatest among the many great Jewish converts since St. Paul, is the center of attraction and attention. And like a great mountain that has stamped the impress of its image on the mind and heart of the curious traveler, Rabbinowitz has stamped the impress of his genius, character and selflessness on the hearts and minds of a multitude of admirers.

It is true that God buries His workmen, and His work goes on. But in the present case it is hard to see the truth of this saying. Rabbinowitz has left many followers; but not one successor. Let us hope that some one, as in spirit he follows Rabbinowitz to the Jordan and sees the fiery chariot taking him to heaven, will cry out with Elisha of old: "The chariot of Israel! and the horsemen thereof!" And may he, as he gazes into the heavens, that have enclosed the noble Rabbinowitz, receiving and wearing his mantle, become his successor indeed!

THE MISSIONARY PERIOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY REV. PROF. L. H. SCHUH, PH. D., COLUMBUS, O.

God always seriously contemplated the salvation of all men. Every period of Old Testament history proves this. In the preparation of salvation for man, we have three distinct periods; first, from the fall of Adam to the flood, 1-1656; second, from the flood to the calling of Abraham, 1656-2083; third, from the calling of Abraham to the birth of Christ, 2083-4225. In each one of these periods God's plan was the salvation of all men.

In the first period, the Lord intended salvation to be universal. He is the Creator of all. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17, 26. All men have a common origin; all have a common nature. God made the race. He views this as an individual. Men constitute a common family, of which the Lord is the father. They have a common relation to God, viz., they were made in His image. They have a common destiny, viz., to enjoy His presence and to dwell

with Him forever. If in this period the Lord contemplated the salvation of one, He must, in view of the oneness of the race as to origin, destiny and divine likeness, have contemplated the salvation of all. And so He did. But His design is frustrated by the perverseness of men. This tendency of utter rejection of God finds its first exponent in Cain; and in his descendants human nature so degenerates as to call forth the avenging justice of God. But the Cainites, called in Scripture, "the sons of men;" were not without influence upon the Abelites, called "the sons of God." These look upon the former, intermarry and the fruit of this union knows not God. So sunken is the race that the Lord can no longer tolerate its presence on earth. "My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh." The race had become antagonistic to God and, save a remnant, Noah and his family, is rejected.

Noah becomes the progenitor of a new race. The Adamic blessing, "Be fruitful and multiply" is given him. So God is again the Creator of the human family, and as to origin and destiny there is the same oneness. In this period salvation must again be contemplated as universal. When men multiply upon the face of the earth, they again follow the inclination of their sinful hearts and cut loose from God. Pride leads them to the building of the Tower of Babel. "Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach to heaven; and let us make us a name," etc. This was the birth of heathendom, the cutting loose from God. The divine plan was again thwarted. God could not save against the will of man. He can not coerce men to salvation. Having so highly preferred man as to give him a will, He must have respect unto the endowments of His creature. He does not again destroy the race, but He confounds their language, which had hitherto been one and thus prevents them from fulfilling their design.

In both of these periods salvation was to be universal. God was thwarted. Such is His love for His creature that He does not desist, but now begins by a round-about way to accomplish what He cannot accomplish directly. Now salvation becomes particular. Jehovah selects an individual, Abraham. It was an election of grace. No reasons are assigned for this choice. Terah, Abraham's father, and his household served other gods. To save Abraham from this religious influence God calls him to leave his country and kin and to go to a land that would be shown him. But at this departure of God, when it appears as though He contemplated the salvation of a few, the promise given to Abra-

ham blazes forth as a beacon light: "In thee and in thy seed shall *all* the families of the earth be blessed." Jehovah does not depart from His first intention. For a period of 2000 years the gentile nations are permitted to go their own way, that like the prodigal son, they may by adversity and misfortune be brought to a sense of their own helplessness and prepared to receive Him, whom He sent into the world as its Deliverer. Now the light dwells only among the Israelites. But when the fullness of time had come, God sent His Son and when His work of redemption was accomplished, a new era burst upon the world. Jesus issues His divine fiat: "Go, preach the gospel unto all nations." So God again returned to His first intention of making salvation universal.

This period of particularism from Abraham to Christ has its missionary age. God chooses an individual and isolates him from all contaminating influences. To him are promised a land and seed and around these two points the life of the patriarchs revolves. This individual is increased into a family and the family is enlarged into a nation. Through Abraham and his seed God is preparing salvation not only for the Jew, but also for the gentiles. Even in this period Jehovah does not dwindle into a diminutive national God, but is still the Lord of the whole race whose salvation He seriously desires.

This nation passes through all the stages of development from conception to decay. It is born under Moses who leads it out from Rameses and guides it toward the land of promise. Under Joshua it conquers its promised land. Under the Judges it has the ideal, the theocratic government. Under the kings the climax is reached. Jehovah is rejected. Israel stands on a slippery incline adown which it passes, until at last it is rejected of the Lord, is given into the hands of its enemies as chastisement and is scattered over the known world. But what to Israel is rejection and punishment is to the gentile nations a blessing in disguise. This period of dispersion, from about 722 years B. C. until the Christian era is the real missionary period of the Old Testament.

The preferring of Israel above other surrounding nations, led to haughtiness and exclusiveness. Necessarily the Jewish religion was exclusive. All others were false; it alone was true. They could not mix. But the Jew should have looked in pity, not in pride, upon his fellowmen. The object of this selection of a nation was to preserve the true religion in its purity. Israel was to be a preacher of right-

eousness amid surrounding wickedness, as were Noah and Abraham to their generation. But instead of accomplishing this, Israel by formality in religion, by legalism, by carnal pride, by insubordination and stiffneckedness, by its vacillation between the true and false gods, became the very opposite of the purpose of its calling. Instead of giving testimony for the true God and His worship, they gave testimony against Him and when they failed in accomplishing the object of their call they were rejected and chastised.

During all this period of gradual decline, God did not fail to indicate to them that they were not called for their own sakes, but that they were simply a means to an end. Jehovah by the mouth of His holy prophets spoke plainly enough about the salvation which was to come to the whole world through the Jews. "*All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.*" Ps. 22, 28. "*Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him.*" Ps. 72, 11. A long list of passages might be quoted which go to show that the gentiles were to come to this light and kings to the brightness of His rising; that the earth was to be full of the knowledge of the Lord; and that Christ was to be a light to lighten the gentiles. But when Israel forgot all this and in pride, bigotry and haughtiness disdained men and even the Lord, the cup of iniquity was full and the rod of correction was applied.

When we speak of a missionary period we do not mean to imply that there was a direct sending for the spread of the Jewish religion. With the single exception of Jonah who was sent to call Nineveh to repentance, the Old Testament does not record any sending to teach. But indirectly the Jewish religion was carried into the then known world by the dispersion of its adherents. Necho, king of Egypt, was desirous of conquering the world. This seems to have been the proud ambition of oriental monarchs before Christ. He swept over the Holy Land and was on his way east, when at Carchemish, 606 B. C., he was repulsed by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. This one in turn marches on Egypt and on his way passes through Palestine and takes Jerusalem. On three separate occasions did he invade the land and take the Holy City. He plundered the temple and carried with him as plunder its sacred vessels and its riches. He took with him captive the nobles of the land as well as the artisans and tradesmen. In all he is supposed to have carried with him 50,000 people into the Babylonish captivity. After the expiration of this term of 70 years liberty was

given by Cyrus to return. While many availed themselves of the privilege, others were so satisfied that they remained in the land of captivity. During these 70 years all the captives and afterward those who remained were witnesses to the truth in Babylon.

Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream. He saw an image whose head was of gold, the chest of silver, the loins of brass and the legs of iron and clay. Daniel was called to interpret the vision. His interpretation was that the head of gold represented the Assyrio-Babylonian empire, the chest of silver was the Medo-Persian realm, the thighs of brass was the Graeco-Macedonian dominion and the legs and feet of iron and clay was the Roman empire. Under the sway of each of these world-powers the Holy Land would pass and in each of them its people should be dispersed. For example, Ptolemaeus Lagi in 320 attacked Jerusalem on the Sabbath day. Their religion forbade the Jews to fight. They were conquered; 100,000 of them were removed to Egypt, notably to Alexandria where they received equal rights with the Macedonians. The Land of Promise is the foot ball of its neighbors. Conquests seem not to end. In 203 Antiochus the Great of Syria conquers the country and in the time of Christ it had passed under Roman rule. In these invasions its people were led away captive. The universal language of the time, the Greek, becomes the language of the dispersed. Their sacred writings are translated into this language and the world at large had access to them.

Whithersoever the Jew went he carried his religion, his sacred writings, his synagogue, his sacraments and his national customs with him and in the providence of God, the gentiles had an opportunity to become acquainted with the faith and the hopes of Israel. While Israel did not carry its religion to the gentiles, such as were attracted by the light were accepted. These could become proselytes and did become such in great numbers. Israel's history was preparing a way for that era of universal preaching into which the Church was merging. Israel was dispersed that it might be chastised; but what was a correction to the Chosen People proved to be a blessing in disguise to the gentiles among whom the Jews sojourned.

Who can estimate the influence of this people, enlightened by the law and elevated by it to a place of moral purity and humanness never attained by those who were groping in darkness. The marriage laws as practiced by these dispersed; the social purity; their kindness to the aged, the widows and orphans and to the very beasts of the

field; the treatment of the stranger and the slave, all of which were the outgrowth of their exalted idea of Jehovah, must have left an impress upon those who witnessed this religious life. Jehovah was not a deity invested with the follies and even the lusts of men, but towered infinitely above them and dwelt in absolute purity. This idea of God elevated the Jew and as his life was an expression of his faith, his example could not help but be uplifting to those who saw it. In Pontus, in Asia, in Pamphylia, in Macedonia, in Syria — in fact in the then known world there was a new leaven at work and it was slowly permeating the whole lump. Many accepted the new religion as superior to their own. This was a stepping-stone over to the Christian religion. When the heralds of the cross either in obedience to the command of their Lord, or impelled by persecutions, scattered the seed, they found a field already prepared by the dispersed Jews. The first missionaries starting from the Holy Land hunted up the synagogues of the dispersed and preached first to them. Acts 13, 5: "And when they were at Salamis, they preached the word of God in the synagogues." Acts 13, 14: "But when they departed from Perga, they came to Antioch in Pisidia, and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day and sat down." These proselytes from among the gentiles to Judaism were among the foremost to accept the Christian faith; e. g. the Ethiopian eunuch who was baptized by Philip; Cornelius of Caesarea who was instructed by Peter; Acts 13, 43: "Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas."

So while the world thwarted God's plans to make salvation universal and compelled Him to make it particular, yet even in this period of His dealings with men, He made it possible for glimpses of light to fall into gentile darkness and paved the way for the rapid spread of the gospel in the new dispensation as ushered in by Christ. The missionary period of the Old Testament was the herald of that greater missionary period of the New Testament.

FUNERAL SERMON.

BY REV. L. H. BURRY, MASSILLON, O.

**AT THE FUNERAL OF AN INFANT, WHOSE PARENTS
WERE NOT MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.**

Ps. 89, 47: "Remember how short my time is: wherefore hast thou made all men in vain?"

Mourning Friends:—The Word of God may well be compared to a doctor-book,—nay, there is no such other book in all the world to which we may run for advice and comfort in all the affairs of life, and especially in the hours of trouble; and men generally, therefore, and more especially Christians, when any great trouble has come upon them, or when they are about to undertake anything of great moment, call for this Book and ask its counsel and advice and comfort.

What ails you, dear people, what your complaint is, that we have been called together here, and that I have been asked to open the blessed Book and to give you some of its comforts,—yes, what ails you, you know better than any one who has never gone through this experience would be able to tell you. Of course, we can see and understand it in a manner; the angel of death has hovered over your home, and it was but short work for him to pick out the lamb in your flock and mark it for sacrifice; a dread, insidious and tenacious disease fastened itself upon this little body, and before you fully realized what was meant, death had taken the soul and winged its flight to eternity. And now, here we are with the lifeless body and are about to lay it to rest.

I understand; and, upon such occasions it is but natural that something in us should say, "Oh, why?" "Oh, wherefore?" It was so among the men of God; the Psalmist here does it. And God expects it; nay, He invites poor souls, when in trouble, to call upon Him, and He will answer. Let me then, in your name, in the words of our text cry, and if possible find an answer and some comfort for our complaint:—

WHEREFORE?

I. *Wherefore hast Thou made men in vain?*

Here and there, perhaps, one in 10,000 reaches the age of three-score and ten, or four-score years, and even of such the Psalmist says (Ps. 90), That their life has been

labor and sorrow, and they are soon cut off and fly away. That grows clearer to us as we grow older. But these little ones that have been here but a few months and years, when they like a shadow flee, and we lay them away and have, as it were, only a few mementoes and a memory left,— they raise the question in us, and we cry at times: Wherefore? Wherefore hast Thou created them in vain?

To such a question as that, God in His Word has many an answer; but there is one that at present, above all others, fixes itself in my mind,—a word of Jesus: “Even so it is not the will of your Father in heaven that one of these little ones should perish,”— (Matt. 18, 14.) And that truth we can work out, to a greater length ourselves.

Although these little ones have lived but a short period in this world, and in this body, they had souls, and these do not die. When the body fell, the soul did not die with it. The soul is the breath of God and is immortal. This body was just the house, the earthly tabernacle, in which it dwelt; the house may fall and the tenant seek a new abode, but that does not say that the tenant lived in vain.

And though these souls are spotted and stained with sin, as all men are, who are born in the image of Adam, they have been bought and cleansed with the blood of Jesus, and I would not say that what Jesus has purchased with His blood, is something worthless,—something that has been created in vain. “God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever should believe on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

And just for such souls as these God made provision in His kingdom of grace. Jesus said, “Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.” For such especially, He has instituted Holy Baptism, concerning which He assures us that the promise is to us and to our children (Acts 2, 39); and of as many as are baptized, He says, by His Apostles, that they have “put on Christ,” they have the “forgiveness of sins,” and the gift of the Holy Ghost. We have been strangers, I am sorry to say, and I am sorry to learn that you have neglected the baptism of your little one. There are so many in our day, who, like the disciples of old, rebuke those who bring them, and many parents in weakness or indifference neglect it, and the children are deprived of this blessing, to which they are

heirs. Let us hope, however, that while this is God's appointed and ordinary way of reaching the child with His grace, in His mercy He may have other ways of accomplishing the same purpose, even though He has not revealed them unto us.

Such then as are made His children, are heirs of the heavenly Jerusalem; and what that means who can describe?

“Jerusalem the golden!
With milk and honey blest.”

No sin, no sorrow, no tears, no death, there! Ah, yes,

“Beneath thy contemplation
Sink heart and voice opprest.” —

Such then, have attained the purpose of their creation. God has made them for Himself. “We have no continuing city here, but seek one to come.” And now, if a soul has reached its goal a little in advance of others; if its sufferings and its trials in this vale of tears have been but for a few months, instead of many years, shall we say that it has been created in vain? No; God help us all to reach the inheritance He has intended for us in Heaven!

But when we look at the case again the thought will arise, and go forth in complaint, and say, again: True, but

II. *Wherfore has its time been so short?*

Why could it not have been allowed to remain a little while longer among us? Why allow it to knit itself and grow fast to one's heart, in love, and then when it has become, as it were, a part of our life, take it so suddenly away?

That is a complaint we often hear.—

There are many homes where there are children who are not wanted; and the poor children will always be made to feel it: Why does not God take such children to Himself, and leave those who are loved to be the joy of their parents, even to old age?

There are some people to whom God should never have given children — if it be lawful to use the expression, humanly speaking — for they will only raise them to serve the devil, and for eventual everlasting death; why not take these children, and leave those of whom we have

at least a hope that they will walk as children of God among men?

And oh! there are so many poor orphans and forsaken children, who have no home on earth; why not take such poor little ones out of this cold world, to their home in Heaven and leave such as these?

In short, we feel that there are so many in this world that could be better spared than such children as this: Wherefore then, has its life been so short? Wherefore?—

To this complaint, I am sure, God could give many an answer, but there is a word spoken by Christ to St. Peter, upon a certain occasion, that appeals to me: "What I do now, ye know not, but ye shall know it hereafter." (John 13, 7.) And God who knows and sees all things, doeth all things well.

Perhaps it was for the welfare of the child. Who knows what might have become of it? Who knows what it might have had to bear? There is many a poor soul who longs for this hour. Who knows what a cross it might have proven to these parents, had it lived? There is many a father and mother, whose gray hairs tell of troubles, and who often sigh: Would to God that my child — my son, my daughter, had been laid in the grave ere these troubles came upon our home! But now it is at rest: There will be no more fever, no more sorrows, no more trouble, for those who are at rest with God. God doeth all things well.

Perhaps, dear parents, God has a purpose in your case. When God causes crape to be hung at our doors, that implies more than the cold message: "Someone has died here;" it means also, "Set thine house in order, for thou shalt die." Perhaps God wants to draw your attention to Himself, and to His Word, and to His Church. When a shepherd wants to lead the parent sheep and the flock, which will not otherwise be led, he will take a lamb and carry it on before. But whatever God's intention is, where your treasure is there your heart ought to be also. Whatever His intention, rest assured what God does is well done; you may not understand it now, but will hereafter.

So let us leave the child with the Lord, and may God help and direct us all, that there may be a joyful meeting that knows no parting in Heaven above. Amen.

NOTES.

A STANDARD BIBLE STUDY HELP.—The Hebrew and Aramaic Handwörterbuch of Gesenius has appeared in the thirteenth edition under the editorial care of Professor Frants Buhl, until recently the successor of Delitzsch in the University of Leipzig, with the assistance of the Arabist, Professor Socin, and the Assyriologist, Professor Zimmern. It is less than three years ago since the twelfth edition was published, and the call for a new edition so soon, notwithstanding the fact that this O. T. lexicon must now share the field with others, such as the Stade-Siegfried and the yet incomplete Briggs-Driver-Brown magnificent work, shows what a wonderful hold Gesenius has on the Bible students of the day. This it amply deserves, as it is the depository of the best advanced, yet conservative scholarship in this department. It is the handbook par excellence for the regular Bible student, while the old Thesaurus of Gesenius and the new Brown dictionary aims to meet the wants of the specialist and detail investigator. It is rare that a handbook like this can be the leader in its department for nearly a century, yet this is the case with this dictionary which, since the first edition in 1810, has, through its various issues, kept steadily alone the forefront of the best Semetic and Hebrew scholarship. Those among the users of this reliable work who admire its conservative character and its refusal to accept the radical Old Testament teachings of the day, may be surprised to learn that originally this Gesenius dictionary was an exponent of rationalism and that in many sections of the American church words of warning were heard a generation ago against its use on this very ground. Now its conservative character has for more than a generation been so assured that the Stade-Siegfried work is really a liberal opposition dictionary. Of all Hebrew dictionaries published the Gesenius Handwörterbuch is doubtless the most reliable standard work for the average student of the Old Testament. It is published by Vogel, of Leipzig at 18 marks unbound, or 20 marks bound; pp. XII; 1030 quarto.

Luthardt's *Kirchenzeitung*, of Leipzig, the most influential conservative church paper in Germany, in a recent issue quotes from a number of French sources, individuals and periodicals to show that the anti-Protestant prop-

aganda that set in some time ago in France is not subsiding, but that the Nantes celebration has rather had the tendency of increasing it. The most remarkable feature in the whole agitation is the fact that Protestantism seems to be arousing opposition also in the minds of prominent and scholarly men. The philosopher and litterateur, Brunetiere, editor of the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and himself a free thinker, in a recent address, said: "Wherever I have been recently I have been to see confirmation of the fact that Catholicism is identical with France and France identical with Catholicism." At the reception of Minister Hanotaux as a member of the French Academy, H. de Vogue, who has all along been regarded as a moderate liberal Catholic, declared that Protestants were really strangers and foreigners in France, and virtually advised the minister to adopt the policy of Richelieu in handling these outsiders. The Paris Journal "Soleil," the chief editor of which, Harvé, is also a member of the French Academy, in discussing the celebration of the Nantes anniversary, compares the Protestantism of two centuries ago with that of to-day and adds: "Whether engaged in industrial pursuits or officials, Protestants always form a body by themselves, aiding, helping and supporting none of fellow-believers. They constitute a state within a state and this state of a necessity must be a traitor to our own. Protestants, not as individuals, but as a body, have anti-French purposes. In politics, in philosophy, in literature, in the arts, they are, above all other things, anti-Latin. And they are extremely fanatical. One of them recently wrote that the Edict of Nantes was the peaceable solution of a conflict that had been waged on battlefields for fifty years. Mark my words, lest this conflict, which is now still carried on in a peaceful manner in our courts of law, finally reach its solution by an appeal to arms." Singular anti-Protestant sympathies appear in unexpected quarters. A leading railway company recently declined to make excursion rates for the Nantes celebration of the Protestants, and when during the Easter week the young evangelist, Debu, was addressing a meeting in southern France, a mob, with the cry, "Throw the Protestants into the river!" attacked and drove him away. It is claimed that if the Protestant peasants had not interfered the threat would have been carried out.

THEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES.—In these days of prolific production, when the discussions and debates on theological and religious problems have assumed international proportions, a well-arranged bibliography of what the writers and thinkers are doing in this line is virtually and absolutely prerequisite. Especially have the Germans been successful in the preparation of such lists of new publications, and several of these are not surpassed in intrinsic value anywhere. The bi-weekly *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*, of Leipzig, edited by Professors Harnack and Schürer, and published by Hinrichs, at 18 marks, is the pioneer in this line, having published such lists regularly for twenty-four years. Quantitatively at least, and possibly also in the division of the titles into various rubrics, this journal is surpassed by the weekly *Theologisches Litteraturblatt*, also of Leipzig, and edited by the veteran conservative, Professor Luthardt; 10 marks per annum. Recently a new bibliography has begun to be published as a supplement to the *Theologische Rundschau*, the new journal begun a little over a year ago by Professor Bousset of Göttingen, as a monthly journal intended by somewhat popular presentation of the theological problems and perplexities of the day, to bridge over the chasm that exists between the critical scholarship of the day and the conservative faith of the masses in the churches. It is published by Mohr, of Leipzig, at the exceptionally low price of six marks per annum. All of these bibliographies are practically international in character, faithfully recording, but to a limited extent, the theological literary publications of England, France, America and other countries, including even Greece and the Orient, and confining themselves not to books alone, but including also magazine articles, book reviews and the like. Quite naturally, these bibliographies occupy a different field from that filled by such larger and ambitious annuals as the *Jahrbuch*, edited by Professor Holtzmann. In recent years this diligence of the Germans has been imitated by the scholars of other lands, the most conspicuous illustration of this being probably the extensive bibliography now published by the "*Biblical World*" and the "*American Journal of Theology*," issued by the press of the University of Chicago.

JERUSALEM PROVERBS.—A deeper than sentimental or merely literary interest is attached to

the new collection of proverbs, sayings etc., recently collected by a resident of many years in Jerusalem, L. Bauer, and published by him in the *Zeitschrift* of the German Palestine Society, Vol. XXI, No. 3. Not only do these proverbs present a type of mind and thought similar to that of the Biblical writers, but a goodly number of them are directly Biblical in matter or form, and not a few are similar to those current among us. We reproduce a selection from this collection of 205 proverbs:

The cat is gone; now, O mouse, hunt your food.

All new things glitter (new broom sweeps clean).

Nobody can carry two melons in one hand (i. e., nobody can serve two masters).

Ask an experienced man, but not a learned man.

Property that is not protected teaches people to sin.

Fire singes only him who wants to tramp it out.

A good word at the proper time is worth a horse.

They have brought horses to be shod, but a mouse holds out its foot (spoken of a person who mixes himself into other people's affairs).

A wasp has taken a seat on a grindstone (a little person tries to interfere with a great thing).

Train a dog and he will bite you (i. e., ingratitude is the world's wages).

All have danced, but I had to pay the bill.

You may enter a noisy stream, but not a quiet one (i. e., still water runs deep).

Do not weep over the past nor regret it (i. e., do not cry over spilled milk).

Tear out the tooth and you will also tear out the pain.

Travel around a good deal and you will see a great deal.

Among those who are one-eyed be also one-eyed (i. e., howl with the wolves).

Rather carry stones with a sensible man, than take a walk with one who bothers you.

If a dog gets into Paradise, then a woman will love her daughter-in-law (i. e., neither the one or the other will take place).

Hold up the wall until we can collect the pay (said of those who work only in order to get their pay).

Give to the bear some silk to unravel (said when an awkward person is entrusted with difficult or delicate work).

The camel limps with his lips (spoken when a poor excuse is furnished).

Whoever is not white by nature cannot be made white by a piece of soap (i. e., you cannot change nature).

Whoever is a dog by nature must bark (same sentiment).

The empty well is not filled with dew (nothing gained without labor).

Even an ugly monkey is beautiful in the eyes of its mother.

The owl loves only its offspring.

Wherever there are many engaged in the same trade, there are not many paras.

The onion has become big and round and has forgotten its past (said of a person who has forgotten his small beginnings).

A bird in the hand is better than a gazelle that vexes you (i. e., a plain but sensible wife is better than a beautiful but useless one).

Whosoever does not listen to his old father will never prosper.

If you strike a blow, strike hard enough to hurt; but if you give to eat, give enough to satisfy (i. e., do nothing by halves).

A leprous goat will contaminate the whole herd (i. e., bad associations corrupt good manners).

My mouth has a larger claim on me than my mother (i. e., look out for No. 1).

Much speaking brings misfortune, but little speaking produces respect.

You will find that only the wounded man boasts.

Whosoever associates forty dogs with certain persons has become one of them.

The house of the parents is the place of play and pleasure; the house of the husband is the place to be trained.

Buy no she ass the mother of which lives in the same quarter of the city (i. e., do not marry a girl whose mother lives nearby).

In eating suit your own taste, but in dressing suit that of other people (i. e., in private life you can do as you please, but in public you must not swim against the stream).

The old bachelor looks at the walls and fears that these are women.

A mistress and two maidens to fry two eggs (i. e., little work for many people).

The foot of the gossiping woman accomplishes no good.

A dog will bark even at the sultan.

If it had not been for you, O tongue, you, O foot, would not have been hurt.

Your tongue is a piece of flesh; as you turn it, it will turn you (the tongue is the source of much harm).

O you, who dig a ditch of misfortune for another, will fall into it yourself.

The greedy man will leave the earth and take nothing with him.

Every horse will stumble and every learned man make a mistake.

If the camel would see its hump, it would break its neck (said of the difficulty men have of seeing their own faults).

There is no blessing without a curse (nothing gained without labor).

Stretch your feet in accordance with the length of the cover (accommodate yourself to circumstances).

On account of the many cooks the food is spoiled.

His father was an onion and his mother leek, how can you expect an agreeable scent from him? (i. e., pedigree and descent will make themselves felt).

A white egg from a black hen (expression of surprise).

The hide of a lion is not empty of bones.

A LATIN CHURCH JOURNAL.—The friends of the Propaganda in Rome publish in the interests of their work an illustrated Latin journal called *Vox Urbis*, which from a literary point of view deserves a respectable place in modern journalism. It is not exclusively theological, but its literary and other departments show the interests of the Church of Rome are of first concern. The contents, prose and poetry, are quite varied, and the Latin has been chosen as the vehicle of communication not for reasons of delectation, but as the best means to have the international constituency of the paper understand what it has to say. Its publisher is Arist des Leonari, in Rome, and it is published twice a month in eight-page folio. Cost about \$2.50 per annum.

ORIENTAL RESEARCH SUMMARIES.—Pick and spade has brought forth in recent years such a wealth of material at the disposal of the Bible student that brief summaries of what can be depended upon as the safe conclusions and teachings of these archæological finds, as unfolded by the skill of the specialists, are really a desid-

eratum. The publication of such a series has been begun by the house of Hinrichs in Leipzig in the name of the Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft, a German society of savants organized for the special purpose of studying the monuments of Western Asia. Of this series, which is called "*Der Alte Orient*," and which is to bring four issues annually at the low price of two marks, the first two have appeared. The first is a carefully-prepared, general survey of the origins and prehistoric fate of the peoples of Western Asia, identical in general with the Biblical races, on the basis of these monumental records, prepared by Dr. Hugo Winckler of the University of Berlin, and is an excellent little compend of 36 pages, giving a clear bird's-eye view of the whole field. The second number in the series is entitled "*Die Amarna Zeit*," and on the basis of the famous Amarna cuneiform letter tablets gives a fine description of the Egypt and Western Asiatic states, including Babylon in the fifteenth century B. C. The next issue will treat of the History, Religion and Civilization of the People of Western Asia; a Record of the Excavations of the English in Assyria and Babylonia; of the Americans at Nippur; and of the Germans at Sendshioli; and a third of the Achæological Finds in South Arabia.

THE JOANNINE PROBLEMS.—Probably the most signal triumph of conservative Biblical research has been the vindication of the authenticity of the Gospel of St. John. Little more than a generation ago it was regarded as a work of critical acumen to reject this gospel, but now those who do not accept it as either directly or indirectly the production of the Apostle John are few and far between. Recently a German pastor emeritus, Dr. G. Wetzel, has begun the publication of a two-volume work that covers the ground completely and gives the results of the vast detail researches of the late decades in defense of this priceless gospel. The work is entitled "*Die Echtheit und Glaubwuerdigkeit des Evangeliums Johannes*," Vol. I (Leipzig, 1899, pp. 186, three marks). The second volume is to follow soon. It is a superior résumé in compact and condensed form of the whole Joannine problem and its solution. Its importance is indicated by the fact that Professor Zöckler, of Greifswald, in his "*Beweis des Glaubens*," No. 8, 1899, devotes a special article to Wetzel's arguments and discussions.

In this connection it is instructive to refer to three articles of considerable length in the *Theologische Rundschau*, Nos. 7, 8 and 9 of the current volume, in which Dr. A. Meyer gives a detailed discussion of the ups and downs of the Joannine debate at the hands of the leading literature of the last ten years. The survey makes more certain the fact that the steady trend and tendency of the argument during this time has been in the line of a confirmation of the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. The articles are an excellent guide for the closer study of this most valuable book in the New Testament collection.

PALESTINE.—The dedication of the Church of the Redeemer in Jerusalem by the German Kaiser some months ago, is the consummation of a project dating back fully a generation, which has been of deep interest to the Hohenzollern family for decades and more. The plot upon which the church is erected was a mountain of ruins, presented to King Wilhelm I long before he became Emperor of Germany by the Sultan of Turkey. The ground has a history of its own, and the present is not the first church erected on it. It belonged to the Knights of St. John as early as 1048, and the Grand Master of the Order, Raymond du Poy, from 1118 to 1159, on this very spot erected a magnificent church between the years 1120 and 1130, called *St. Maria Latina Major* — which fact explains the curious statement current in many papers that the new edifice was a "St. Mary's" Protestant church. In 1187 the church was converted by Saladin to other purposes, parts of it being used as a home for the demented. The Hohenzollern family took formal possession of the tract in 1869 when the crown prince visited Jerusalem. Diplomatic difficulties prevented the erection of the church until in 1892 Wilhelm II, with his customary energy, arranged to have the project realized. He himself took part in preparing the plans and specifications, the tower being built in accordance with his ideas. In 1893 the cornerstone was laid by Dr. Barkhouser, the head of the Prussia consistory. The contractor was F. Adler, selected by the emperor himself, while the superintendent of construction was Groth, who also supervised the renovation of the famous Luther church in Wittenberg a decade ago.

RUSSIA.—The Russianizing of the old Nestorian church in Koordistan and North Persia goes on apace. An American expert writes from Urumia that the hand of Russia is all powerful in Northern Persia, and its mission cannot fail to have enormous influence. Just a year ago the preliminary mission returned from St. Petersburg, and sent there a bishop and several priests of the Nestorian church, who were duly consecrated in the Russian Church. The procedure of the Russian missionaries is rapid and outwardly thorough. In each village the Nestorian Church building is taken possession of without any question of legal right. It is then consecrated according to the Orthodox Catholic faith and the ritual of the Holy Synod. That done, applicants for membership are received kneeling in assent, renouncing by a representative the "errors" of their venerable creed and forefathers. They thus accept the Russian Church, and the Communion service follows. Replying to the priest, a bishop, they declare that they cast aside the false teachings of Nestorius and Theodorus, especially the doctrine of the two persons in the Lord Jesus Christ, and that they accept the orthodox creed of one person. The converts repudiate Mariolatry, receive the seven Synods or Ecumenical Councils, and accept the Saints of the Orthodox Church. They are told that when they bow before the pictures of the saints they are to consider that they are not honoring the picture, but the memory of the saint. In the same region the French Roman Catholic mission is declining, in spite of the lavish use of money which has bought over one branch of the Patriarch's family. The Anglican Mission established by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, has become somewhat liberalized under his successor, and holds pleasant intercourse with the experienced missionaries of the American Presbyterian Church, who were the first to begin work at Urumia in 1835. The Germans have opened two orphanages under Dr. Lepsius, at Khoi and Urumia. Altogether there will not be many left of the two hundred thousand people who formed the Nestorian Church ten years ago. Russia will certainly absorb the majority, but the native Evangelistic Board under the Americans is holding its own.

GERMAN RELIGIOUS JOURNALS.—The most noteworthy new venture in the religious newspaperdom of the Fatherland, is the publication of a weekly entitled "Der

Alte Glaube," the avowed object of which is to appeal to the educated and the thinking classes and present to them the old truths of conservative Evangelical Christianity, not only as matters of doctrine, but also as the best principles for all the conditions and relations of life. The journal is a sixteen-page publication issued from the house of Wallmann in Leipzig, and edited by a prominent layman, Count (Freiherr) von Diersburg, and Pastor Gassmann, and costs eight marks per annum. It goes without saying that it is an opposition publication to the weekly "Christliche Welt," which has for half a dozen years been trying, under the skillful management of Pastor Rade, to make liberal and radical Christianity presentable to the educated laity. The new journal proposes to offer these classes what the famous "Luthardt's Kirchenzeitung," probably the best religious journal in the country, has for a generation been doing for the church at large, as the exponent and representative of the best conservative and confessional religious thought of Germany. (Leipzig, thirteen marks per annum). The organ of conservative thought in the department of scientific research is the "Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift," of Munich, which accepts what can be fairly called the results of honest and fair Biblical criticism, but with skill and great learning defends the cardinal principles of old-fashoined truth. It is the organ of the best representatives of conservative research of the whole Empire. Not to be forgotten in this connection is the "Beweis des Glaubens" (Guetersloh, Bertelsmann, monthly, 10 marks), with Professor Zoekler, of Griefswald, as the chief editor. This is without doubt the most thorough, and scientifically the best apologetical journal in existence. The readers of these four periodicals will find in them the best conservative religious periodicals of Germany.

CHURCH HISTORIAN AS FICTION WRITER.—Years ago the German Christians were agreeably surprised by the publication of a number of intensely interesting works of fiction that were evidently based on a close and accurate study of church history. The pseudonyme "George Taylor," which graced the title page, kept the readers guessing as to the author who possessed such an exceptional gift of uniting popular method of presentation in the shape of story and fiction with exact scholarship and detail data, until it was found that these works were the

production of Professor Haurath, the famous church historian of the University of Heidelberg. The majority of these volumes deal with the Reformation era, and this has been the period where Haurath has found the theme of his new and latest volume of this kind in his recently published "Pater Maternus" (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1899. Price about \$2.00). The subject was suggested by the famous journey made by the Monk Luther to Rome, to which the Reformer himself ascribes such a potent influence in the formation of the ideas and the ideals that guided the mighty upheaval of religious thought and life in the sixteenth century. Maternus goes to Rome, but finds the eternal city and its ecclesiasticism anything but what he has dreamed. Through the influence of a converted Jew he is led to the adoption of the principles of justification by faith alone. In other words, while Maternus is not Luther, yet Haurath, in the form of a narrative, describes the genesis of the central ideas that controlled Luther and his Reformatory work, and does so on the basis of an exact and historically reliable picture of the religious, social and literary atmosphere of that remarkable period. The new work of this veteran, now more than sixty, is an historical romance of the highest order and a classic of its kind, fully deserving of being placed by the side of "Klytia" and other similar volumes by the same author. Haurath shares with the late Professor Ebers the distinction of being probably the only University men in modern Germany who have been able to utilize their exact scholarly researches for the purposes of fiction, but stands higher than Ebers, who has been constantly charged with having modernized his characters, in being absolutely true to historical facts and data. Haurath has also been successful in popularizing accurate historical knowledge in essays and other sketches in leading journals. Thus he recently gave a masterly description of Luther as a "Klostereroberer," in the Daheim, 1899, No. 19 and 20, and of Luther and Alexander in the Beilage of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

PRACTICAL UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS.—A very marked change can be noted in the attitude of the German theological professors toward the practical problems and perplexities of the church. In former years the German theological teacher was essentially a book man, given only to scholastic research and detail study. Now a sys-

matic effort is made by the leading men of theological learning to come into contact with the rank and file of the university and help solve the living problems of the day. Among the participants in the ninth Evangelical Social congress held in Berlin recently, none were more active than Harnack, Kafton, von Soden, of Berlin; Gregory, of Leipzig; Titius, of Kiel, and other University men. The same is true of the conventions of the Gustavus Adolphus Society, the Protestant *Bund*, the Mission Conventions, and the like. Popular "vocation lectures" are delivered regularly in various university centres, especially at Bonn, Königsberg and elsewhere, to which pastors are invited to hear of the latest results of theological research. Special conferences between University men and the pastors of different conferences are regularly held, e. g., in Hessen, of which Giessen is the University; in Hannover, where Göttingen is the provincial university; at Schleswig, with Kiel, the object being to bring such men into closer contact with each other. Not infrequently professors publish volumes of sermons, as this was lately done again by Professor Kafton, of Berlin. Organs seeking particularly to popularize the results of scholarly investigation are on the increase, the latest being a splendid bi-monthly *Theologische Rundschau*, edited by Dr. Bousset, of Göttingen. In nearly all these synodical and conference conventions, university men and the pastors sit side by side, uniting in deliberations for the welfare of the church. Not unfrequently the latter take a decided stand against the teachings and views of the former. This is especially the case where the Ritschlian theology, through its university advocates, seeks to find an entrance into certain circles of the church. At the recent General Synod of Prussia the pastors overthrew the proposition of the university men among it, making the latter the sole arbiters of the fitness of candidates for the university. This new innovation in the German church is already being productive of good results for all concerned. The chasm between the theology of the universities and that of the church in general can possibly be bridged over, each side learning better to appreciate the views and position of the other. Probably the most worthy feature in the whole matter is the fact that the rank and file of the clergy, representing the conservative and traditional thought of the church almost everywhere, appears to be the active and aggressive element, while the new departures

of it, represented chiefly by the liberal university circles, are on the defensive.

THE OLDEST PRINTED BOOK.—Just at the present time, when preparations are being made to celebrate in Mayence on a grand scale and with international co-operation, the five hundredth birthday of Guttenberg, the question as to which was the first book printed has aroused a lively interest among littérateurs because of the appearance of a new claimant for this honor. This new claimant is a *Missale Speciale* in the possession of the Antiquarian Book Concern of Rosenthal in Munich, which literary specialists, among them Dr. Falk, Stein and Hupp, declare for typographical reasons to be the oldest printed book extant, and to antedate even the famous Guttenberg Psalter of 1457. Recently the French leading authority on liturgics, Misset, has examined this work and reached the conclusion that for liturgical and historical reasons this book must have been older even than the forty-two line Bible of Guttenberg, i. e., the oldest edition credited to 1450. The title of his work is "Le premier livre imprimé connu: Un missel spécial de Constance, œuvre de Guttenberg, avant 1450, Paris, 1899, Librairie Honore' Champion." This title indicates the author's conclusions, namely, that the *Missale* of Rosenthal is an extract from the famous Constance *Missale* and must have been printed even before 1450.

A TEXT BIBLE.—One of the most valuable condensations and summaries of the best of modern Biblical scholarship and research is to be found in the *Text-Bibel des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, edited by Prof. E. Kautzsch, of the University of Halle, and published by Mohr, of Freiburg, Leipzig, and Tuebingen. It is a combination edition of the Kautzsch version of the Old Testament and the Weizsaecker translation of the New Testament, to which is added the lately published version of the Old Testament Apocrypha. The Old Testament portion is the joint work of a dozen savants, as is also the Apocrypha translation. The canonical portion was issued in 1894, but with extensive literary comments. Weizsaecker's New Testament has been a classic and standard work for a generation, and has furnished the model for the Old Testament version of Kautzsch. The present edition is simply a text edition, containing the best translation of the Scriptures that modern scholarship is able to produce, being an

entirely independent version with the object of presenting the Biblical thoughts in a way that the sacred writers would have employed if they had written in the nineteenth and not in the first and earlier centuries. It is thus a thoroughly modern translation in the best sense of the term, presenting the results, but not the processes of the best scholarship, in so far as this is at all possible in a translation. Two editions are published, one with and the other without the Apocryphal books, the former costing 10.50 marks unbound and 12 bound, and the latter 9 marks unbound and 10.50 bound. The New Testament is sold alone at 2.40 marks unbound and 3 or 4.80 bound.

A SCHOLAR'S TRAVELS IN THE BIBLICAL ORIENT.—What is probably the most scholarly work on travels in the Biblical Orient that has appeared for years is now being issued, namely, Dr. von Oppenheim's travels, entitled "Durch den Hauran, die Syrische Wueste, und Mesopotamien," of which the first volume and half has just been issued with magnificent illustrations, and four new typographical charts, by Richard Kiepert (Berlin, Reimer, 1890. Price about \$4.00). The author, who is a recognized scholar, and has for years been in the employment of the Turkish government in Cairo, and a student of the peoples and races of the East, has not only journeyed with open eyes along routes not frequented by the average traveler, but on the basis of the classical and the ancient and modern Arabic literatures and the best of Western investigations, has thoroughly discussed the ethnology, geography, history, antiquities, as also the modern political and social status of these districts. In some features, such as the account of the deserted cities in the Hauran, the character and religion of the Druses and others, he is able to give data that are new and very instructive. Special interest is added by the fact that he has travelled practically over the route selected for the contemplated Anatolian Railway. In short, Oppenheim's volume is of exceptional worth because it is the product of an exceptional scholarship.